THE TWELVEPENNY SERIES 4

THE REFORMATION AND THE EUCHARIST

By FRANCIS WOODLOCK, S.J.

Third Impression. 1s. *net.*

LONDON: SHEED & WARD

236.308
W859

THE TWELVEPENNY SERIES IV.

THE REFORMATION
AND
THE BLESSED EUCHARIST

WITH A CHAPTER ON
ANGLICAN PRAYER BOOK REVISION

BY
FRANCIS WOODLOCK, S.J.

ALMA COLLEGE
LIBRARY
Alma, California

Third Impression

SHEED AND WARD
31 PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.4

1916

First Published 1927
Second Impression - *Jan.* 1928
Third Impression - *Oct.* 1928

Printed in Great Britain
at the BURLEIGH PRESS, *Lewin's Mead,* BRISTOL.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	INTRODUCTION - - - - - - - -	5
I.	THE BELIEF OF THE PRE-REFORMATION CHURCH OF ENGLAND - - - - -	7
II.	THE REAL PRESENCE, THE REFORMERS AND THE PRAYER BOOK - - - -	24
III.	THE REFORMED CHURCH AND THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS - - - - -	39
	A Note on Transubstantiation - - -	59
IV.	CATHOLIC TRUTH AND PRAYER BOOK REVISION - - - - - - - -	66
	INDEX - - - - - - - -	81

Imprimi Potest
HENRICUS KEANE, S.J.
Præp. Prov. Angliæ.

Nihil Obstat
F. INNOCENTIUS APAP,
S.Th.M., O.P.
Censor Deputatus.

Imprimatur
EDM. CAN. SURMONT,
Vic. Gen.

Westmonasterii, die 4 Augusti, 1927.

INTRODUCTION

In this little book are printed four lectures delivered in Farm Street Church on the Wednesday evenings of June, 1927. The subject was chosen in view of the Anglo-Catholic "Eucharistic Congress" and the final meeting of the General Assembly for Prayer Book revision which were to take place at the beginning of July.

Nothing that was brought forward by speakers at these important sessions makes it necessary for me to modify what I said in the Farm Street pulpit during the previous month.

The Anglo-Catholic Congress lecturers made no attempt to prove that the present-day teaching of the extreme wing of the party with regard to the Sacrifice of the Mass is to be found in the writings of the great Caroline and Jacobean divines of the Anglican Church. The doctrine about the nature of the Holy Sacrifice which was expounded at the Albert Hall Congress in 1927 was Catholic, but no attempt was made to prove that it was Anglican. This omission, in view of the special need of such proof at the present time when the doctrinal continuity of Anglicanism with the Pre-Reformation Church as regards the Mass has been publicly challenged, is most significant and may reasonably be interpreted as an admission that no such proof from the history of Anglican dogma can be presented.

These lectures once more echo the challenge to Anglo-Catholicism to produce evidence that its doctrine of the Mass is Anglican.

It is useless for a party to point to the Catholic teaching about the Holy Sacrifice in the Albert Hall, while that teaching is at the same time being repudiated by Archbishops, Bishops and Clergy in the General Assembly of the whole Church at Westminster.

An Anglo-Catholic theologian, Canon Gouge, D.D., has said in his *Conflicting Tendencies in the Church of England* (p. 9), " Strictly speaking, it is not the individual who is or who can be Catholic, but the Church : and unless all members of the Church of England possess Catholic status, not one of them can do so."

This theological truth makes the transactions of the General Assembly which manifested the real mind of the Church, of vastly more importance than the Congress which only revealed the present-day belief of part of the Anglo-Catholic party.

The Assembly made it clear that comprehensiveness rather than Catholicity is the characteristic mark of the Reformed Church of England. In this point this great Council of the Anglican Church stands in sharp contrast with all the Councils of the Catholic Church, whose aim was ever to preserve the purity and unity of the Faith even though that involved the excommunication of heretics.

The author wishes to express his indebtedness to *The History of the Blessed Eucharist in Great Britain*, by the late Fr. Bridgett, C.SS.R., for much of the matter contained in Chapter I.

FRANCIS WOODLOCK, S.J.

Feast of St. Ignatius of Loyola.

I

THE BELIEF OF THE PRE-REFORMATION CHURCH IN ENGLAND

In any controversy as to the continuity of a Christian Church, doctrinal continuity must stand out as a primary test.[1] The Church has a message of truth to hand on through the centuries, and a Church which claims to be infallible in uttering its message must not teach to-day a doctrine which contradicts its teaching of a thousand years ago.

There may be, nay in a living Church there must be, some doctrinal development, but that development, if legitimate, will only be a fuller and a clearer expression of the old truth or else an unfolding of truths which were implicitly contained in the former teaching and are now explicitly expressed.

From the earliest ages in the Christian Church the truth about the Blessed Eucharist, both as Sacrament and Sacrifice, was clearly taught, but, as in the case of the doctrines defined against Arius at Nicæa, the more technical expression of Eucharistic doctrine and the standardizing of the terminology in which it is taught date from that period in

[1] This principle was recognized by the final Court of Appeal in the famous case settled in 1905 between the 'Wee Frees' and other Scotch bodies, where the Lord Chancellor and other judges decided that the conservative 'Wee Frees' were the authentic Free Church and entitled to all the endowments, because they had clung to the original creed of their Church and refused to change with the times.

the Church's life which saw the beginning of heresy against the Eucharistic truth in the denial of the Real Presence in the Sacrament. The Church adopted no new doctrine when it accepted the word 'transubstantiation,' any more than it invented a new doctrine when it chose the word 'consubstantial,'' and introduced it into its Creed.

It is unthinkable that the Church should have no '*depositum fidei*,' no message of revelation, about its greatest Sacrament and about that Sacrifice which has been from the first the central act of its corporate, divine worship.

That the Catholic Church should not be able to give any coherent teaching as to the meaning of Our Lord's words 'This is my Body,' 'This is my Blood,' 'Do this in memory of Me'; that she, who has such definite teaching with regard to the Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation, should have to say, 'I do not know the meaning of My Lord's words with regard to the Blessed Sacrament' would be indeed strange—nay incredible.

And so we find that the testimony of tradition is at least as clear as to the meaning of what happened at the Last Supper as it is with regard to the two great mysteries which are the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith.

In the following pages, it is not my purpose to prove from Scripture, tradition and the Church's conciliary definitions the truth of those Eucharistic doctrines which we hold to-day. My aim is rather historical, and it will be attained if I am able to show that from its birth up to the Reformation the Eucharistic teaching of the Church in England was substantially the same as that given by the Catholic

Church to-day, and that at the Reformation that teaching was repudiated, the Real Presence of Christ under the Eucharistic veils and the Sacrifice of the Mass were rejected and that a new and contrary doctrine was adopted and a new liturgy framed to express it.

In the present chapter I shall attempt to show that the doctrines of the Christian Britons, Angles, Scots, Saxons and Normans, who finally coalesced to make the British nation, had all the same Eucharistic beliefs as each other, and that those beliefs were substantially the beliefs professed by the Church Catholic and Roman to-day. That is to say, we shall find ourselves in doctrinal continuity with our forefathers of pre-Reformation England with regard to these vital truths.

If Anglo-Catholics to-day claim that they hold to our beliefs, if they, like us, boast that those beliefs were from the beginning the faith of the English Church, we must point out that the centuries that have passed since Cranmer lived, are centuries in which the traditional theology of the Anglican Church has been definitely Protestant and that those centuries destroy any claim that Anglicanism can make to continuity with the Catholic past in its Eucharistic belief

Let any one read the testimonies which follow and note how natural the words would sound to-day on the lips of a Catholic, and see how Anglican formularies have to be twisted to be made in any degree patient of the meaning which lies on the surface of words written in England more than a thousand years ago.

Though the ancient British Church, founded

during the Roman occupation existed centuries before the coming of St. Augustine, we need not delay on its history, for it can hardly be said to have survived, except in Wales. The members of that Church were in controversy with St. Augustine on some matters of discipline, with regard to the proper date of celebrating the feast of Easter, with regard to the proper shape of a priest's tonsure and with regard to certain minor baptismal ceremonies, but there is no trace in history of any differences as to belief in the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Blessed Eucharist and as to the Sacrifice of the Mass. Nor is this remarkable, for both the British and Saxon Churches owed their Christian faith to the same source. Both received that faith from Rome.

With regard to this orthodoxy of the British we have the testimony of St. Jerome who tells us: "The Church of the City of Rome is not different from that of the whole world. Gaul, *Britain* and Africa and all barbarous nations adore one Christ and *follow one rule of truth.*" (*Ep.* 101).

St. John Chrysostom also speaks of the British Church, saying: "Even the British Isles have felt the power of the word, for there, too, churches and altars have been erected; there too men may be heard discussing points in Scripture, with different voices but not with different belief." (*Contra Jud et Gent.*, c. 12). I quote this passage because the words used by St. John for 'altars' is the technical word for 'altars of sacrifice'—*thusiasteria.*

When the British Bishops of York, London and Caerleon attended the Council of Arles more than 1,600 years ago, they must have shared in the dis-

cussion with regard to Eucharistic discipline, when the Council in its fifteenth canon censured some deacons for usurping sacerdotal functions at the celebration of Mass.

We have the testimony of Gildas that in Britain the altars, which he speaks of as 'holy' and 'venerable,' were in most churches built of stone, and the Mass which was celebrated in Latin on these altars, was spoken of as '*sacrosancta sacrificia*' and '*coeleste sacrificium.*' From the first, the sacrificial aspect of the Mass was emphasized along with the belief in the Real Presence. The reverence due to Christ in the Host, which Host is ordinarily spoken of as 'a sacrifice,' appears from the heavy penance of a three years' fast enjoined upon a priest should he through carelessness (*casu negligens*), have lost a Host when carrying It with him in making a journey.

The only fragment of British, as distinct from Scottish or Irish liturgy which survives to us in an eighth century MS. is a part of a Mass and this is Roman in form, as one would naturally expect.

The Venerable Bede testifies to the unity of faith among the Britons, Angles, Scots, Picts and Latins who were to be found inhabiting the island in his time, the eighth century.

St. Ninian, a noble Briton of the fifth century, went to Rome to study theology and returned thence as a Bishop to be the apostle of the north. He would naturally have taught his converts the Eucharistic truths and ceremonies which he had learnt in Rome.

Adamnan, who wrote the life of St. Columba, tells us of a miraculous provision of wine which was lacking for "the sacrificial mystery," the Mass

Though not strictly a British testimony, I may note that in a Gothic-Gallic Missal contemporary with the life of St. Columba, on the feast of the Epiphany when the miracle of Cana is narrated in the Gospel of the day, the people pray that: 'He who then changed water into wine, may now change the wine of oblations into His own Blood,' an early expression of the change which later was expressed by the technical theological word 'transubstantiation.' (Mabillon, *De Liturg. Gal. I.*)

When St. Augustine landed in Kent, we are told that he obtained permission to preach and baptise and celebrate Masses ('missas facere'), and Bede also speaks of the first Saxon bishop of London, St. Mellitus, as saying Masses (celebratis in ecclesia missarum solemniis) and giving the Eucharist to the people in the church dedicated to St. Paul.

St. Birinus, the apostle of the West Saxons, was sent from Rome by Pope Honorius in A.D. 634 and we have the interesting record that the Pope gave him "a pall or corporal on which he was accustomed to consecrate the Body of Christ and in which also he used to wrap the Lord's Body and carry It with him hanging from his neck. But when he consecrated the sacred mysteries, he placed it on the altar." (*Gesta Pontif.*, p. 157.[1])

[1] The eighth century Pontifical of Egbert expresses beautifully the belief in the Real Presence and Holy Sacrifice in the prayer for the blessing of corporals for Mass. "Oh God who didst allow Thy whole Self to be wrapped by Joseph in a winding sheet woven of linen, kindly take heed unto our words. We beseech Thee . . . to bless and hallow these corporals for the use of Thy Altar, to consecrate upon them or to cover and wrap in them the Body and Blood of Thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ . . . so that whatever shall be immolated according to Thy Sacred Rite upon them unto Thee, as Melchisedech offered up to Thee an acceptable holocaust . . . so may our sacrifices become acceptable." (Quoted in Bridgett's *Hist.*, p. 80.)

This passage would seem to indicate a form of reservation under one species, such as is recorded as permissible to the faithful in the time of persecutions in Rome.

This St. Birinus built a church at Winchester and consecrated it to SS. Peter and Paul. (Bede, III. 7.)

When St. Wilfrid was driven by his enemies out of his see in York he devoted himself to finishing the conversion of the South Saxons and established at Selsey an episcopal see which was afterwards moved to Chichester. He founded a monastery at Selsey, and Bede (*Hist. Ecc.*, IV. 14) records the story of the miraculous preservation of the inmates of the monastery from a plague after the celebration of Masses ' in all the oratories.'

He tells us that a boy who was sick in the monastery had had a vision of the Apostles Peter and Paul who sent through the child an instruction to the abbot to have the Masses celebrated. Bede records that " a particle of the Lord's Oblation from the same Sacrifice " was carried to the sick boy as Viaticum, his heavenly visitors having promised to conduct him safely to his reward.

The account mentions the celebration of many Masses in different oratories, which shows us that in those days ' Sacrificia missarum,' the celebration of many private Masses, was not regarded as an abuse. The sick child, also, would seem to have received his *Viaticum* only under the appearance of bread, ' a particle ' being mentioned.

In the writings of Venerable Bede we have frequent mention of the Mass and a variety of phrases are used to emphasize its *sacrificial* aspect.

Thus we find : ' the solemnities of Masses being

celebrated' 'to offer the Victim of the holy oblation for a dead man', 'a particle from the Sacrifice of the Lord's oblation,' 'the offering of the Saving Victim,' 'to offer to God the sacrifice of the saving Victim.' He tells us in words so natural to Catholic ears today: "We immolate again (denuo) to God, for the furthering of our salvation, the Sacred Body and precious Blood of the Lamb by which we have been redeemed from sins."

The priest in his ordination was authorized by the Anglo-Saxon Pontifical to "offer up oblations for the living and for the dead, and for his own weal and the weal of all the people he was to transform, by an unspotted blessing, the Body and the Blood of the Son of God." (cf. Rock, I. 27.)

The Anglo-Saxon word 'housel' stood for Hostia, the Victim of Sacrifice. Words and phrases similar to those used by Bede are found in Adamnan the Scot.

In early writings we have the secret operation by which the bread and wine are changed into Our Lord's Body and Blood expressed by '*transferre*,' '*commutare*,' '*transcribere*,' '*transformare*,' '*convertere*,' words which convey the same general sense as was later expressed by 'transubstantiation.'

More than a thousand years ago, Alcuin writes to a priest: "I beg you will not forget your friend's name in your holy prayer. Store it up in one of the caskets of your memory and bring it out in the fitting time *when you have consecrated bread and wine into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ.*" (*Ep. ad Paul in. Patr. Aquil.*)

In nearly all Anglo-Saxon Pontificals we have a prayer which the Bishop recited at the consecration

of an altar begging that it be made worthy that on it "a secret power may transform those creatures chosen for the Sacrifice into the Body and Blood of the Redeemer." (See Bridgett, *Hist.*, p. 35. *n.*)

The following passage, attributed by Dr. Darwell Stone to Haymo, a pupil of Alcuin and written about the year 841 might well stand in a theological treatise of the twentieth century. Everything is there expressed and only the *word* 'transubstantiation' is missing.

"That the substance of the bread and wine which are placed upon the altar is made the Body and Blood of Christ by the mysterious action of the priest and thanksgiving, God effecting thus by His divine grace and power, it would be the most monstrous madness to doubt. We believe then, and faithfully confess and hold, that the nature of bread and wine, by the operation of divine power . . . *is substantially converted into another substance,* that is unto Flesh and Blood. Surely it is not impossible to the omnipotence of Divine Wisdom to change natures once created into whatever It may choose, since when It pleased It created them out of nothing. . . . It is then the Invisible Priest who *converts visible creatures into the substance of His own Flesh and Blood* by His secret power. In this which we call the Body and Blood of Christ, the taste and appearance of bread and wine remain to remove all horror from those who receive, but the nature of the substances is altogether changed into the Body and Blood of Christ. The senses tell us one thing: faith tells us another. The senses can only tell what they perceive, but the intelligence tells us of the true Flesh and Blood of Christ and faith confesses it.

"This also the faith of those who receive the Sacrament ought firmly to hold, that whatever fragment they may seem to receive of this Sacrament, *they receive the Body of Christ not divided and separated into parts*, but wholly complete." (cf. Darwell Stone, *Hist.*, I., p. 235.)

St. Gregory the Great, writing to St. Augustine whom he had sent to England, speaks of the purity required by him who in Communion 'receiveth the Body of Almighty God.' In his Dialogues, speaking of the Mass, St. Gregory says: "the only begotten Son of God . . . though He be living in Himself immortal and incorruptible, is *again sacrificed for us in the mystery of Holy oblation.*"

The Anglo-Saxon Pontifical, in a blessing for a canopy to be placed over an Altar expresses the sacrificial and propitiatory nature of the Mass when it speaks to God of 'Thy venerable Altar, on which Thy Only Begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, *Who is the propitiation for our sins, is constantly immolated by the hands of the faithful.*' (Bridgett, *Hist.*, p. 38.)

Here we have not a vague '*pleading* of the Sacrifice of Calvary,' to use an Anglican phrase, nor an upward glance to the Lamb that was slain and makes perpetual intercession in Heaven, but a definite statement of a Divine Victim lying on an earthly altar.

Lanfranc, the first Norman Archbishop of Canterbury, came to England after his conflict with Berengarius the heretic who denied the truth of the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence. Berengarius had retracted his heresy and relapsed again almost as often as Cranmer did with regard to the same

Eucharistic belief. Lanfranc's statement of the theology of the Blessed Sacrament gives the distinction of substance and accidents of which the scholastic theologians made use in explaining the nature of the change wrought by God's Power at the Consecration. He says: "We believe that the earthly substances which are consecrated by the priestly ministry on the Lord's Table are converted, ineffably, incomprehensibly, marvellously by the operation of Divine Power, into the essence of the Lord's Body, the appearance, however, and some other qualities of the Bread and Wine remaining, lest the communicants should feel horror at receiving Flesh and Blood (cruda et cruenta), and also for the greater merit of believers. Nevertheless the Body of the Lord remains in Heaven at the right hand of the Father immortal, inviolate, integral, uncontaminate, unhurt. So that it may be truly said that we receive the very Body which was born of a Virgin, yet not that very Body. It is that very Body, if you consider its essence and propriety and efficacy of its true nature. It is not the same, if you consider the appearance and the other qualities of bread and wine This faith has been held from the beginning and is still held by that Church which is called Catholic because it is spread throughout the world." (*De Corp.*, t. II., p. 187.)

Lanfranc was succeeded by St. Anselm. The latter says: 'According to the definitions of the Holy Fathers it is to be understood that the bread laid upon the Altar is changed by the solemn words of our Lord into His Body, and that the *substances* of bread and wine do not remain, but the *species* remain, that is the form, colour and taste. It is,

therefore, in these species that changes take place, not in the reality.[1] Though the wicked do not receive the virtue of the Sacrament, yet it must not be denied that they receive not only the species, but also the true substance of the Body of Christ.' (*Opera,* II., p. 163.)

Our first English Cardinal, Robert Pully or Pulleyne, in time of Henry I. is also most explicit:

" The Lord by the power of His benediction, both in His Own Person converted and now through His ministers converts the bread into His Body and the wine into His Blood, so that neither the bread nor the wine remain what they were, but pass into another nature, the bread into Flesh, the wine into Blood." (Migne, *P.L.*, t. CLXXXVI.)

Adam Scot at the same period teaches the same theology in Scotland, where he was Bishop of Withern in Galloway in 1177. " While the *species* of bread is seen, its substance is not there : and the substance of Christ's Body is really there, although its form appear not." He adds, " The power of God can cause that one Body should be in different places at the same time, and the whole Body in every part of the outward 'species.' " (Quoted in Bridgett, p. 47.)

Though these men wrote long before the definition of Transubstantiation in the Lateran Council in 1215, they state clearly the doctrines taught by that Council.

Do not these words of St. Aelred, a witness for the Scottish Church at this period, sound like a twentieth century Christmas sermon, in a Catholic church ? " What was the sign that the Shepherds

[1] i.e., if the ' species ' are broken, Christ's Body is not broken.

received? You shall find the Infant wrapped in swaddling clothes and laid in a manger. I could say many things about this sign, but one must suffice. Bethlehem means 'the house of bread.' It represents the Holy Church in which the true Bread, the Body of Christ is ministered. The manger in Bethlehem is the Altar in the Church. . . . In the manger is Jesus, wrapped in swaddling clothes. The swaddling clothes are the sacramental veils (tegumentum sacramentorum). In this manger under the appearances of bread and wine are the true Body and Blood of Christ. There Christ Himself is believed to be, but wrapped in swaddling clothes; that is to say, invisible in the Sacrament. We have no other so great and evident sign, of the birth of Christ, as that we receive daily His Body and Blood at the Holy Altar: and that He who was once born for us of a virgin *is daily immolated* in our sight. Therefore let us hasten to the manger of the Lord, first preparing ourselves by Grace 'in a pure heart and a good conscience and an unfeigned faith' that associated with the Angels we may sing 'Gloria in excelsis Deo'." (St. Aelred, *Ser.* II.)

The Norman Archbishops found nothing to correct in the beliefs of the Saxon and Celtic Church.[1] Berengarius could not boast a single supporter from Britain until in 1381 Wycliffe began openly to deny the Catholic Doctrine, and until in the sixteenth century the Reformers uprooted the Mass and all it stood for in England.

Thus, in Pre-Reformation England, from the

[1] Guitmund, one of the chief opponents of Berengarius, who had lived in England, testifies that: 'notissimum est hoc tempore priusquam Berengarius insanisset hujusmodi vesanias nunquam fuisse.' (Migne, P.L., cxlix. p. 1489.)

earliest times we have the Mass as the great act of worship for which the churches were built and consecrated.[1] We have it as a propitiatory Sacrifice, offered for the living and the dead, and the numberless 'chantries' suppressed at the Reformation deprived the souls of the dead of the fruits of the Masses for the celebration of which these chantries were founded.[2]

We have record of the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament, and of the regulations for the renewal each week of the Consecrated Host reserved above or beside the Altar.

Father Bridgett records that in the ceremonial details of the ordination of early British priests, we find the anointing of their hands with chrism because those hands were to touch the Sacred Host.

The Canon of the Mass in the Anglo-Saxon liturgy was almost word for word as it stands to-day in the Roman rite. That Canon has in all probability been only slightly altered since the fourth century. It stands as an evident link in the chain of continuity.

[1] The Council of London in 1237 decreed that all Churches are to be at once consecrated "because in them the heavenly Victim, living and true, namely the Only-begotten Son of God is offered on the altar *for us* by the hands of the priest." (Quoted Bridgett, p. 200.)

[2] "Henry VIII suppressed 2,374 chantries just before his death, but with strange inconsistency he left orders that Masses should be said for him for ever requiring his son, Prince Edward, and all his heirs and successors who should be kings of this realm, as they would answer before Almighty God at the dreadful day of judgment, to carry out his will." (cf. Bridgett, *Hist.*, p. 136.)

The singing of a latin hymn on May Day on the tower of Magdalen College takes the place of a Mass for the welfare and repose of the soul of King Henry VII. Possibly few who take part in that picturesque ceremony are aware of its origin. (cf. Bridgett, p. 245.)

A Protestant writing on the history of his Common Prayer Book tells us :

" The only known liturgy of the English for 900 years before the Reformation was the Roman Missal, with local variations of ' use ' which were then customary throughout the Roman Communion." (Upton, *Outlines of Prayer Book History*, p. 21.) These ' local variations ' did not touch in any appreciable degree the traditional Canon of the Mass.

In a word, our British, Celtic, Saxon and Norman forefathers had one Eucharistic doctrine and that was the Catholic doctrine to which we cling to-day.

I have not gone into particulars about the lesser details such as the elevation of the Host at Mass and the special adoration at that moment, which arose after Berengarius' denial and possibly was introduced as a protest against that denial. The thirteenth century decrees of Bishop Quivil of Exeter regulate for the ringing of the small sanctuary bell and the big Church bell at the elevation.[1] We have record of the old custom at Eton of boys leaving their books and hastening into Church to adore Christ at the Elevation on hearing the warning bell, then returning to their work. A more practical form of intermingling their devotions and their work was planned by Dean Colet for St. Paul's. He rules : ' At the Mass, when the bell in the school shall ring

[1] Bishop Quivil's decree says : ' The Host should be raised so high as to be seen by the faithful bystanders : thus their devotion is increased and the merit of their faith. The parishioners should be exhorted that, at the elevation of Christ they do not bend the knee irreverently, but kneeling adore their Creator with all devotion and reverence. To this they shall be excited beforehand by the ringing of a little bell and at the elevation the great bell should be struck thrice.' (Wilkins, II. 131.)

to sacring, then all the children in the school, kneeling in their seats, shall with lift-up hands pray in the time of sacring. After the sacring, when the bell knelleth again, they shall sit down to their book learning.' (Knight's 'Life of Colet,' p. 306.)

The saluting the Blessed Sacrament over the altar of the College Chapel at Winchester survives to-day in the custom of lifting their caps which the boys still observe when passing the Church.

This adoration of the Host was particularly objectionable to Archbishop Cranmer, who styled it 'idolatry,' and it is so regarded to-day by Evangelical and Modernist Anglicans and by Nonconformists.

It is not necessary here to trace at length the history of the change from Communion received by the laity under both species to the present custom of the Latin Church of reception only under one kind. For centuries it had been the custom of the Church to communicate infants under the one species of wine, a custom which had become obsolete before the thirteenth century. Communion under the species of bread alone was the general practice in the parochial churches of England before the end of the same century. With the doctrine of the Real Presence fully accepted, it was recognized to be a change merely in ceremonial discipline, for Christ was recognized to be as completely present in the Host alone, as under the two species of bread and wine.

It has been my purpose in this short sketch of the history of the Eucharistic belief in England up to the time of the Reformation to keep to the essential belief that the bread and wine are by consecration

changed into the Body and Blood of Christ in the propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass. The testimonies I have quoted make it sufficiently clear that the Pre-Reformation Church in England held substantially the same belief as is held by English Catholics to-day. That is to say, we are in doctrinal continuity with the Pre-Reformation Church. Can Anglicans make the same claim and support their claim by similar evidence for the centuries between the time of Cranmer and Pusey ?

II

THE REAL PRESENCE, THE REFORMERS AND THE PRAYER BOOK

In the last Chapter we examined some of the evidences of the Eucharistic beliefs of the British, Celtic, Anglo-Saxon and Norman Church in England. That evidence established the fact that our forefathers in the Church of this land from the very beginning had the same Eucharistic beliefs that we Catholics have to-day. The Real Objective Presence was, I showed, described in words which are practically synonymous with the technical word 'transubstantiation.' Our forefathers believed that the Bread and Wine by Consecration are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, and Christ was adored under the Eucharistic veils. Also we have record of the Sacrifice of the Mass, prominent from the beginning of the English Church's history as the central act of Christian worship. The existence of this belief of the Pre-Reformation Church is a fact on the very surface of history.

Now we come to the changes in doctrine and ritual[1] which were admittedly introduced by the reformers and which persist in the Common Prayer Book and Articles compiled to embody the new ideas.

And let me at once strike a warning note. We should be on our guard in reading certain modern interpretations of the Reformation settlement.

[1] "Little more than one-tenth of the Communion Office of 1549 was derived from the Sarum Missal. It was practically a new service."—('The English Church and the Reformation,' by C. S. Carter, p. 145.)

Anglo-Catholics feel bound to hold that nothing was done at the Reformation to destroy the Catholicism —and hence the continuity—of the Anglican Church. They believe with us that the Sacrifice of the Mass is the essential act of Christian worship, and they believe that the Real Objective Presence of Christ after the Consecration of the elements is independent of the faith of communicants. It is there before they receive; It remains if the Sacrament is reserved.

These beliefs they *know* to be essential to Catholicism, for Anglo-Catholics recognize that they are held by both East and West. Therefore it is important to find the expression of these beliefs in the Prayer Book and Articles or at least they must not be rejected by the Anglican formularies. An Anglo-Catholic, then, approaches the study of the Reformation with a strong bias. He knows that if he should find the rejection of such fundamental truths as the Real Presence and Sacrifice of the Mass, he must leave his heresy-infected Church for one which has kept the truth.[1] No true part of Christ's Church can teach heresy as part of its message and still remain part of the true Church.

Next we must note that if we wish to know the authentic meaning of any words in the Prayer Book which are declared to be ambiguous, it is more reasonable to give the words that meaning which we

[1] Some Anglo-Catholics seem frankly to admit the evil effects of what the reformers accomplished. Thus, in a hymn printed in the handbook of a London Anglo-Catholic Congress their work is thus described:

"Then came the unbelievers, they wrecked the House of God,
Tore down the Sacred Altar, and underfoot they trod
The Sacrament of Jesus, defiled His holy shrine
Cast out the Mystic Presence, the Power of God Divine."

know to be the meaning intended by the men who compiled the Book. Let me quote on this point a passage from a learned Benedictine historian who is an authority on Reformation history, Dom Norbert Birt, O.S.B. He says: "To depend on Andrews, Bramhall and a host of other Jacobean and Caroline Divines for an interpretation of the meaning and scope of formularies drawn up many decades before their time is beside the mark. . . . It is vital to know precisely what was meant by those who first used them." ('*Line of Cleavage*,' p. 23.)

We shall be more likely to get at the real mind of the Reformed Church of England by studying the minds of the reformers who moulded and who controlled the Edwardine and Elizabethan Church, than by studying the modern views of those who must be suspect of special pleading, because they have such a compelling reason for finding in controverted passages a meaning consonant with their present-day beliefs.

Now the Prayer Book which has been recently under revision is that of the year 1662 and is practically identical with Cranmer's Second Prayer Book which first appeared in 1559. That second book took the place of the first 'Common Prayer Book' which had only three years of life, being first appointed for use in 1549.

This second book is so predominantly Cranmer's work and his influence in its composition was so little hampered by Catholic opposition, that, I believe, to know Cranmer's mind is to know what that Prayer Book originally meant to those who first used it. Of Cranmer's predominating influence in the composition and imposition of the new Prayer

Book which was to supplant the Catholic Missal, Breviary and Pontifical, we are told by Strype who says that "nothing was admitted into the liturgy without his leave, and nothing was rejected or impeded (from admission into it) which he judged proper to insert." (*Memorials*, I. 302). The same testimony is given in many places by the Zurich letters, and the original copies of the liturgy are found to be either in his handwriting or else annotated by him, and are unanimously ascribed to him. (Cf '*Vindication*,' p. 98.) That the Book of 1552 was regarded as a thoroughly Protestant book may be argued from the satisfaction given by it to the continental Protestants, who had criticized the remains of Catholicism which seemed to be in the First Book. We shall leave for the present the consideration of Cranmer's belief as to the Eucharistic Sacrifice. His views were admittedly shifting, but by 1552 they had taken their final form.

In Cranmer's biography by C. H. Smyth, we are told that "Cranmer was never a Lutheran. Whenever he was taxed with it, he always, by implication at least, denied it. He was sympathetic with the temper of Lutheranism but never subscribed to its doctrines. Nor did Latimer whose mind was profoundly under Cranmer's influence." Cranmer held the same views about the Eucharist as Martin Bucer and the Strassburg school of reformers. (Cf. Smyth's "Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI," pp. 24 and 59.) What, then, did Cranmer believe about the Presence of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament? He says: "But all that love and believe Christ Himself, let them not think that Christ is corporally in the

bread ; but let them lift up their hearts unto heaven and worship Him sitting there at the right hand of His Father. Let them worship Him in themselves, whose temples they be, in whom He dwelleth and liveth spiritually : but in no wise let them worship Him, as being corporally in the bread. For He is not in it, neither spiritually, as He is in man, nor corporally as He is in Heaven, but only sacramentally, *as a thing may be said to be in the figure,* whereby it is signified." (*Reply to Gardiner,* Book IV., p. 238.)

Again : " The eating of Christ's Flesh and drinking of His Blood is not to be understood simply and plainly (as the words do properly signify) that we do eat and drink Him with our mouths : but it is *a figurative speech,* spiritually to be understood, that we must deeply print and *faithfully believe in our hearts, that His Flesh was crucified and His Blood shed for our redemption.* And *this our belief in Him is to eat His Flesh and drink His Blood, although they be not present here with us, but be ascended into Heaven.* (*ib.*, Book III. ch. x.)

He seems to teach a ' receptionist ' doctrine when he writes : " Although (to speak properly) in the bread and wine be nothing indeed to be worshipped, yet in them that duly receive the Sacraments is Christ Himself inhabiting and is of all creatures to be worshipped," (Book I, p. 4), and a ' virtualist ' doctrine in the words : " And although Christ be not corporally in the bread and wine . . . He is *effectually present and effectually worketh,* not in the bread and wine but in the godly receivers of them, to whom He giveth His own Flesh spiritually to feed upon." (*ib.* p. 31.) In the following passage he explains the meaning of a ' spiritual ' and sacra-

mental presence. "And although Christ in His human nature, substantially, really, corporally, naturally and sensibly be present with the Father in Heaven, yet *sacramentally and spiritually* He is here present. For in water, bread and wine, he is present as in *signs* and *sacraments:* but He is *spiritually* in the faithful Christian people which according to Christ's ordinance be baptized or receiveth Holy Communion and unfeignedly believe in Him." (*ib.* p. 43.)

Cranmer often draws parallels between Holy Communion and Baptism and repeatedly asserts that as there is no Real Presence in the water of Baptism, so there is none in the bread and wine of the Eucharist. He also illustrates 'virtual presence' from the example of the sun which "corporally is ever in heaven and nowhere else and yet *by its operation and virtue the sun is here on earth.* . . . So likewise Our Saviour Christ bodily and corporally is in heaven, although spiritually He hath promised to be present upon earth with us to the world's end. . . Godly men *spiritually by faith* eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood, although the same corporally be in Heaven, far distant from our sight." Cranmer denied that the wicked receive the Body and Blood of Christ in *any* sense—as they do not eat 'spiritually.' This makes the 'real absence' clear. "The eating and drinking of Christ's Flesh and Blood is not taken in the common signification, with mouth and teeth to eat . . . *a thing being present,* but by lively faith in heart and mind to chaw and digest a *thing being absent,* either ascended hence into heaven or else not yet born upon earth." (*ib.* Book III., p. 112.)

The last words refer to the faith of the saints of the Old Testament, the prophets and others, who by that faith spiritually did eat Christ's Body and Blood before He came.

He says the bread and wine, which he compares to the Paschal Lamb 'be not Christ's very Body and Blood, but they be *figures* which by Christ's institution be, unto godly receivers thereof, *sacraments, tokens, significations, representations* of His very Flesh and Blood." (*ib.* III., p. 137) Elsewhere he tells us why the Sacrament is *called* Christ's Body and Blood. "The substance of bread and wine do remain still and be received in the Sacrament: and although they remain, yet *they have changed their names* so that the bread is *called* Christ's Body and the Wine His Blood: and the cause why they have changed their names is this, that we should lift up our hearts and minds from the things which we see, *unto the things which we believe and be above in Heaven:* whereof the bread and wine have the *names* although they be not the very same things in deed." (*ib.* p.137.)

To Cranmer then the 'spiritual eating' of Christ's Body consists solely in 'believing and remembering Christ's benefits and resolving them in our minds.'

Hence, to sum up, according to Cranmer Christ is only present by His grace and 'virtually' by His Power; the eating is a metaphorical phrase—it is only by Faith in remembering His death that we spiritually eat His Flesh. He is '*in no wise*' in the bread and wine but only in the souls of 'godly receivers' by His grace. There is a 'real absence' rather than a 'real presence.' "No more truly is He corporally *or really* present in the due administra-

tion of the Lord's Supper, than He is in the due ministration of Baptism: that is to say, in both, spiritually by grace." (Pref. of Answer to Gardiner.)

When Cranmer brought out his first Prayer Book in 1549, there were a number of passages which were ambiguous. Gardiner, the Catholic minded Bishop of Winchester, immediately fixed on these passages and showed how they could bear a Catholic sense.

It is noticeable that though Cranmer attempted to prove that the *real* sense of the passages in question was the Protestant one, yet, because the ambiguity had been pointed out to him, *he changed or omitted every one of these passages* in the second book of 1552, which is substantially the book now in use.[1]

It is in his reply to Bishop Gardiner that Cranmer is most explicit and definite in his exposition of his doctrine which denies a real Objective Presence in the consecrated elements. Thus, when Gardiner quoted the words of the prayer that by the blessing of the Holy Spirit the bread and wine 'may be unto us the Body and Blood of Christ' as a prayer which begs God to work the wonder of Transubstantiation,

[1] Bullinger, the successor of Zwingli wrote (about 1560) "The Edwardine Reformation satisfies the godly. Much better is it (i.e., more Zwinglian) than the Confession of Augsburg. (Smyth, *ibid.*, p. 78.)

This testimony, while not proving that the Prayer Book is Zwinglian, shows conclusively that it does not contain a doctrine of a real Objective Presence. A Protestant writer, Albert Mitchell, says (in "The Holy Communion"): 'Cranmer, replying to Stephen Gardiner, repudiates every attempt of Gardiner to read the unreformed doctrine into the 1549 Book, but nevertheless every point on which Gardiner claimed to score, was altered in the 1552 Book.' With regard to later revision, the Bishop of Durham declares (*Edinburgh Review*, April, 1923) that 'neither the Elizabethan nor the Caroline revisers of the Edwardine Book had any other object in their work, than to render the Prayer Book a more efficient expression of the Protestant religion.'

Cranmer replied: "Christ is present wherever the Church prayeth unto Him and is gathered together in His name; and the bread and wine be made unto us the Body and Blood of Christ (as it is in the book of Common Prayer) but *not* by changing the substance of the bread and wine into the substance of Christ's natural Body and Blood, but that in the *godly using of them they be unto receivers* Christ's body and blood. And therefore in the book of holy Communion we do not pray absolutely that the bread and wine may be made the body and blood of Christ, *but that unto us* in that holy mystery they may be so; that is to say, that we may so worthily receive the same, that we be partakers of Christ's body and blood and that therewith in spirit and in truth we may be spiritually nourished. (Reply to Gardiner, Bk. III, p. 79.)

In the Second Book these words and others on which Gardiner had fastened were omitted or changed so as completely to exclude any Catholic sense.[1] All that seemed to express a real Objective Presence had to go. The suppression of the Elevation at Mass and the adoration of the Host had been one of the first of the Reformation changes. In the second Book the 'Agnus Dei,' "Behold the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world," was omitted before the Communion and even the "Blessed be He who cometh in the name of the Lord" was cut out of the Preface, obviously lest it might suggest the 'coming of Christ' at the Consecration.

[1] Mutilations and excisions are doctrinally of greater significance than the mere absence in a rite of any clear expression of doctrine. The "Church Times" recognized this in part when it said apropos of Anglican Orders: 'It is true that the Anglican

When the 1552 book was revived in the days of Elizabeth in 1559, a new form of administration of the Communion was introduced by an amalgamation of the forms of 1549 and 1552, and we have now these words said as the communicants receive the bread.

"The Body of Our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto Everlasting life. Take and eat this, in remembrance that Christ died for thee and *feed on him in thy heart by faith* with thanksgiving."

Cranmer had explained again and again that this 'eating by faith' establishes communion with a Body absent in heaven, not with One present in or under the Sacramental species.

We have devoted our attention chiefly to Cranmer's views for the reason stated by Strype, but we may note that Ridley, Barlow, Nicholas Ferrar and Goodrich, who were Cranmer's episcopal associates, and Richard Cox, John Taylor and Miles Coverdale, all divines belonging to his party, were in agreement with their chief in his 'reform' of Eucharistic teaching.[2]

And now let me say a few words about what is called the 'Black Rubric,' which in the Common Prayer Book is the final rubric governing the Communion service. It is in the form of a 'declaration' or doctrinal statement of Anglican belief.

Reformers were not only silent in the Ordinal as to any intention to confer the power of sacrifice, but they actually cut out the reference to sacrifice which the older formula contained. To cut out is a more significant action than to refrain from putting in.' (Quoted in *Tablet*, November 28th, 1925, p. 710). The significance of the action in this case was clearly to cease the ordination of 'sacrificing' priests in the Church of England.

[2] (cf. *Vindication*, pp. 98-102 where quotations from the works of each are given in support of my brief statement.)

The rubric first appeared in the second Edwardine Prayer Book of 1552. When that book was being printed, we are told that such strong objections were raised by extreme Protestants to the practice of kneeling at Communion, that the printing of the Book, though authorized by Parliament, was suspended until the question had been referred to Cranmer. John Knox, one of the extremists, appears to have secured the insertion of the rubric by the authority of the Council and by Royal Proclamation. When Parliament in Elizabeth's reign ordered the use of the 1552 book which had previously been approved by the Parliament of Edward, the rubric was omitted as lacking that Parliamentary authority, being, as I have said, introduced by Royal Proclamation in Edward's reign. Its absence from the 1559 Book is thus explained.

The rubric was restored in the 1662 Book, at the request of the Presbyterians at the Savoy Conference which took place between twelve Bishops and twelve Presbyterian ministers: but the words 'corporal presence' was substituted in 1662 for the words 'real and substantial presence' which were in the 1552 form of the rubric.

I print it below in the form in which it stands to-day. I cannot see that the change of the words '*real and substantial*' into '*corporal*' so completely alters the meaning as Anglo-Catholics contend.

Dr. Darwell Stone speaks of the change as 'of great significance.' He admits that the form of rubric in the 1552 Book 'must be regarded as a denial of the doctrine that the consecrated sacrament is the Body and Blood of Christ.' Even receptionists had between 1559 and 1662 come to claim that they

received 'the real and substantial' Body, and it has been stated that the change was made in their interest, so as not to seem to condemn this virtual presence in the souls of 'godly receivers' which they had come to describe as 'real and substantial' in opposition to Zwinglianism.

Some Anglo-Catholics regard the declaration as merely a denial of a gross, carnal and materialistic conception of Christ's presence, and as in no way affecting the teaching of the scholastics and of the Council of Trent.

The 'Black Rubric' states: "Whereas it is ordained in this office for the administration of the Lord's Supper, that the Communicants should receive the same kneeling: (which order is well meant, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgement of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the Holy Communion as might otherwise ensue): yet, lest the same kneeling should by any persons, either out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved: it is hereby declared, *that thereby no adoration is intended or ought to be done*, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians), and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one."

The whole purpose of the rubric is to explain that the kneeling does not express adoration either of the bread and wine or of any corporal Presence of Christ's Body and Blood. Is it likely that the Presbyterians would have agreed to the change of 'real and substantial' into 'corporal' if the change was understood to imply that there *was* a real and substantial presence such as the Scholastic theologians and the Council of Trent believed in? And if the Anglican Church teaches that there is a real and substantial presence of Christ in the Host, then the kneeling *ought* to express the adoration which is due to Him. Nor can any emphasis on the word '*natural*' make it mean "in its natural condition, occupying space, with all its accidents, visible, ponderable, etc.," for no one has ever suggested that Christ's Body in the Eucharist is in Its natural, extended, visible condition. If the rubric is allowed to bear its obvious meaning of denying the Objective Presence of Christ in the Consecrated Host, it makes sense and its existence in the Prayer Book of a Protestant Church is justified. If Anglo-Catholic interpretations are applied to it, it makes nonsense and is regarded as solemnly denying a mode of Christ's Eucharistic presence which nobody in the whole history of Christianity was so foolish as to assert. And, on Anglo-Catholic principles there should be a rubric to command, not forbid, adoration, if Christ is really present. To see a deep meaning in the substitution of the word '*corporal*' for '*real and substantial*' or 'flesh' for 'Body' is a good example of the eager catching at straws by Anglo-Catholics in their effort to find support for beliefs which the Reformers definitely rejected.

Speaking of the change of wording in the ' Black Rubric ' the *Guardian* of March 3rd, 1927 said that " the whole meaning of the declaration was now altered : and ever since 1662 this rubric has *implied that adoration of Christ really and essentially present in the Eucharist is a practice recognized by the Church of England.*" This seems an unwarranted deduction for obviously the rubric exists to explain that though the communicant kneels, *he is not adoring Christ really present in the Sacrament*, and if Christ were present, manifestly the adoration directed to Him would not be idolatry.

That rubric still stands to-day in the Prayer Book, and the Prayer Book and xxxix Articles are still the standard of Anglican belief.[1]

I have only to notice briefly the portion of the Catechism which deals with Communion. This was added to the Prayer Book in 1604, the year after Elizabeth's death, at the Hampton Court Conference. In this Catechism it is said that ' the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.'

It is sufficient to note as Canon A. P. Cox has pointed out in his book on ' Prayer Book Teaching ' (p. 6) that " these words are not to be taken as teaching a real objective presence of the Lord in the elements. The words were not censured by the Puritans at the Hampton Court Conference or at the Savoy Conference when Protestant objections were raised by the Presbyterians on other matters : and the Confessions of Faith of all Reformed Churches use

[1] How strong was the feeling against kneeling at the reception of Communion is seen from the fact that a proposal to make kneeling optional was only rejected by one vote in the Convocation of 1563. (cf. " The Anglican Via Media," S. Carter, p. 28.)

similar language." If the words clearly involved the Catholic belief which Anglo-Catholics find in them, then they would have been criticized and objection taken to them by the Calvinistic Protestants present at the Conferences. They had no objection to the words though they utterly disbelieved in any Objective Presence in the Bread and Wine; we may conclude, then, that the words do not necessarily teach that Objective Presence. Even that ardent Anglo-Catholic, Dr. Darwell Stone, could only say that 'the additions made to the Catechism in 1604 and the Prayer Book of 1662, like the Elizabethan Prayer Book, require a belief in the reception of the body and blood of Christ by faithful communicants, and *incline towards* the doctrine that the body and blood are present in the Sacrament at Consecration and before reception, without insisting on the acceptance of this doctrine.' ('*Hist.*' II, 355.)

III.

THE REFORMED CHURCH AND THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS

So far, we have seen that the Reformers rejected that abiding, permanent, objective, Real Presence of Christ under the sacramental appearances of bread and wine, in which the pre-reformation English Church believed. To-day that Real Presence is taught by Anglo-Catholics. They believe it to be Catholic Truth and so they believe it *must* also be an Anglican doctrine. Otherwise their Church must be admitted to be in heresy and to have therefore been cut off from the Catholic Church by this very fact that it committed itself to heretical doctrine.

We come now to the all important matter of the Sacrifice of the Mass. Here again we find that Anglo-Catholics are forced to claim that their Communion Service is to-day and has been since the Elizabethan settlement, really and in every essential particular the same Sacrifice which is offered in all the Catholic and Orthodox Churches of the world. Let us remember the prayer I quoted from the old Anglo-Saxon Pontifical in a previous lecture. It speaks to God of " Thy venerable Altar, on which Thy Only-begotten Son Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who is the propitiation for our sins, is constantly immolated by the hands of the faithful." :

and the words of St. Gregory who sent St. Augustine to England that in the Mass:

"The Only-begotten Son of God . . . though He be living in Himself immortal and incorruptible, *is again sacrificed for us in the mystery of Holy Oblation*"; and the words of the Venerable Bede: "We immolate again (denuo) to God for the furthering of our Salvation the Sacred Body and Precious Blood of the Lamb by which we have been redeemed from sins."

Masses we know were offered in pre-Reformation England for the living and for the dead. They were in the past, as they are to-day, the central act of worship in the Catholic Church. And to-day every Eastern Orthodox Church is also united with Rome in its belief that in the Mass, not bread and wine, but the Real Body and Blood of Christ—Christ Himself—is offered on the earthly altar to the Father in Heaven for the living and for the dead.[1]

[1] The Synod of Jerusalem declares that "A true and propitiatory sacrifice is offered for all the faithful, living and dead. (Dosith, Conf. Decr., 17.)

With regard to the Real Presence in Orthodox belief, we may quote the profession of faith sent to the English Non-Jurors in 1723. In it the Patriarchs say: "We believe that in this sacrament our Lord Jesus is present, not typically nor virtually, nor by His Grace as in other sacraments . . . nor by impanation, as the Lutherans say ignorantly and unworthily, but truly and essentially: so that after consecration the bread is changed, transubstantiated, transmuted and transformed into the very Body of the Lord that was born at Bethlehem of the ever Virgin. . . . Further we believe that after consecration the substance of bread and wine is no longer present, but the Body and Blood of the Lord under the form of bread and wine." (A. Maltzew, *Die Liturg*, p. 219.)

In the 'Longer Catechism of the Orthodox Church' however it is declared that though 'The Bread and Wine are changed or transubstantiated into the very Body of Christ and into the very Blood of Christ. . . the word transubstantiation (metousiosis) is not to be taken to define the manner in which the bread and wine are changed into the Body and Blood of the Lord; for none

Were Anglo-Catholics to admit that they had rejected and were without this Holy Sacrifice it would be fatal to their claim to be part of the Catholic Church.

I may note that to possess the Mass is not of itself a proof of Catholicity. The Arians, Nestorians and other heretical bodies who were excommunicated from Catholic membership and communion took with them true Orders and a correct belief about the Mass. But to reject the Mass *is* of itself a sufficient proof of being outside the Catholic Church, and in the sixteenth century the Sacrifice of the Mass—the offering of Christ the Sacred Victim on our altars—was undoubtedly rejected by the Lutherans and Calvinists abroad and by Cranmer and his followers in England. The rejection of Papal Authority and of the Sacrifice of the Mass was the fundamental Protestant platform in the Reformation change of doctrine.

First then, let us note how extreme Anglo-Catholics claim openly to have the Mass to-day in their Church and definitely teach that Catholic belief about the Mass which was quite clearly rejected by the Reformers who framed their Prayer Book.[2]

can understand this but God: but only this much is signified, that the bread truly, really and substantially becomes the very true Body of the Lord.'

[2] Lord Halifax, in his 'Further Considerations on behalf of Reunion' says: "I defy anyone to see any difference between Mass as said in the parish church at Hickleton (with the acquiescence of ecclesiastical authority), and Mass as one might hear it in any village church in France.' (p. 9.) His Lordship's vicar apparently used the 1549 Book. Whether it was supplemented by the Roman Missal, as was the practice in some Churches in the South of England, I do not know. If not, obviously no one could fail to see the difference between the Hickleton 'Mass' and that of the Latin Church.

We have the claim made in that now famous 'Declaration of Faith' which was signed by Bishop Gore and over 3,000 Anglo-Catholic clergymen and offered to the Eastern Orthodox Churches as an authentic statement of the official teaching of the Anglican Church. When presenting the Declaration to the Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria in June, 1924, they admitted that: "It is true that amongst us there are other voices, but we believe that this document represents *the historic witness of our communion both for* the *past and for* the *present.*" ("Christian East," June, 1924.) I agree that the Declaration with regard to the Blessed Eucharist does represent the Pre-Reformation belief in England. It also represents the belief of the Catholic Church to-day. But to call it the historic witness of the Anglican Communion during the last 375 years or to say that it is the expression of the official Anglican faith to-day is to state what simply is not a fact; it is to state what is disproved by all the evidence of religious history since the Reformation and by the existence to-day of a large majority of the members of the Anglican Church, both clerical and lay, who repudiate the doctrine.

In the 'declaration' we are told that the signatories affirm that they hold it to be the genuine doctrine of the Anglican Church that they have received Apostolic Orders through their Bishops "with the purpose that we should offer the unbloody Sacrifice of the Eucharist for both the living and the departed. We hold that by consecration the bread and wine are *changed and become* the true Body and Blood of Christ, and we hold that *Christ, thus present, is to be adored.*"

This doctrine is expanded more fully in a widely circulated tract[1] on the Anglican Communion Service, which is called throughout 'the Mass.' The Anglo-Catholic writer of the tract states (and remember that he is speaking of the Anglican Com munion Service) : "The Mass is a sacrifice in the most complete sense. (1) It is *the offering of the Body and Blood of Christ under the Veils of Bread and Wine.* (2) It is offered by a lawful minister, the priest, who is the earthly agent of the Great High Priest. (3) It is offered to God alone. (4) *For forgiveness of sin* ; and (5) To call down God's grace. (6) It is a Sacrificial feast in which the worshippers feed upon a Sacred Victim. The Mass is therefore *a sacrifice in every sense of the word.*"[2]

I would have you note that when the author admits that this sacrifice is offered 'for the forgiveness of sin,' he states that which makes the sacrifice 'propitiatory' and not solely of 'lauds and thanksgiving.'

Again I agree that this Anglo-Catholic tract states and explains the true Catholic doctrine of the Mass. But does it describe truly what happens at an Angli can Communion ?

[1] John Bull Tracts. *The Daily Mass*, p. 4.

[2] In a sermon preached by Dr. Kidd, Warden of Keble College, in the College Chapel on January 30th, 1927, this prominent Anglo-Catholic theologian states much the same doctrine. I quote from the 'Church Times' report. "The Sacrifice of the Church is the Holy Eucharist. . . . There is first the offering of alms and oblations . . . the second is the (offering) of the gifts now consecrated and become the Body and Blood of our Lord ; and this is what is meant by the old phrases 'sacrificium laudis' and 'hostiæ gratiarum' now combined into our single and familiar phrase 'this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving,' i.e., not the sacrifice which consists of our feelings of gratitude but the Eucharistic Sacrifice of thanksgiving of Christ Himself there present under the forms of bread and wine." (Ch. T., February 4th.)

Dr. Darwell Stone is an Anglo-Catholic theologian who knows undoubtedly more about the history of the Blessed Eucharist than any other Anglican. He knows, too, from his deep study that the Catholic Mass is a true sacrifice. Like other Anglo-Catholics he is bound to try to find and to assert that this Catholic Mass is preserved essentially in the Communion Service of his Church or he would have to leave her for Rome. How does he describe the Mass? He tells us that "The Holy Ghost acts by His Divine Power and *transforms the earthly elements* (the bread and wine) *into the Body and Blood of Christ.* . . . In the Eucharistic Sacrifice we plead before the Father the Body and Blood of Christ, His human life *made present* in our midst on the altar by the Consecration. . . . *We offer Him in Sacrifice to the Father.* . . Both for the Sacrifice to the Father and for the gift to Christians there is need of the truth that at the Consecration *the bread and wine are made the Body and Blood of Christ.*" ('The Eucharistic Sacrifice,' p. 29.)

This is Catholic doctrine, but Dr. Darwell Stone has not learnt it from the Anglican Church formularies or from the great Anglican Divines. It is not found in Anglican theology till comparatively late years. Newman testifies that even the Tractarians of his Anglican days did not believe themselves to offer the kind of Sacrifice described above when they celebrated the Anglican Communion Service.[1] That is

[1] "What the thirty-first Article repudiates is undeniably the central and most sacred doctrine of the Catholic religion: and so its wording has ever been read since it was drawn up. And conformable to it has been the doctrine of Anglican divines, even of those who held that there was a sacrifice in the Eucharist. They might not like the outrageous language of the article, but as far as I know and believe, none of them have maintained

to say, this idea of offering in sacrifice a Divine Victim on the earthly altar is Catholic, but Anglo-Catholics are departing from Anglican tradition when they assert that this oblation of Christ's Body and Blood is made in the Communion office of their Church.

There is a fundamental difference between the Catholic Mass and the Anglican Communion. At Mass the Catholic priest looks down on a Divine Victim lying on his altar under the Eucharistic veils and offers Him, really present, to the Father in Heaven: whereas the Anglican Church looks not down but rather backwards to the Sacrificed Christ on His Cross on Calvary or upwards to the Lamb that was slain, now risen and in glory making His intercession in Heaven, and by the priest's and people's prayers it ' pleads ' for the fruits of Christ's death. The two services are essentially different. One is a memory and a representation in symbol and figure of a past Sacrifice: the other is itself a true memorial Sacrifice a ' re-presentation ' in which the Victim of Calvary is really present and really offered by the Church.

And now let us turn to the reformers who framed the Anglican Communion Service. What did they believe about the Mass and what did they mean by their new Communion Office ?

with the Church that Christ is really offered up in sacrifice in the Eucharistic rite." Newman quotes from Pusey's introduction to Tract 81 the words: ' *The false doctrine* was that ordinary persuasion, that in the Mass the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead.' . . . ' By combining the doctrine of transubstantiation with that of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, the laity were persuaded that not only a commemorative sacrifice but that Christ was offered ' and he says in capitals ' The doctrine of sacrifice cannot be the same where transubstantiation is held and where it is not.' (See Newman's *Via Media* (1901 edition), II. 351 seqq.)

Both their words and their actions proclaim their vigorous and absolute rejection of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.[1]

They rejected any offering of the Body and Blood of Christ on the altar under the appearance of Bread and Wine for, as we saw in the last chapter they denied the reality of that Presence. From beginning to end, to their minds there was never any real Victim, any Body and Blood present on the altar to be offered. The rejection of Transubstantiation was not merely the rejection of a philosophical theory to explain *how* Christ was there, but a *denial* of the *fact* that Christ's Body was there on the altar. And the bread and wine were, to their minds, quite unchanged by the consecration, save that they were by it dedicated to be figures and symbols of Christ's Body and Blood, which Body in its reality was absent from the altar and present only in Heaven. At best the bread and wine were sacramental means of conveying to the souls of worthy receivers the graces purchased by Christ's death on Calvary.

Cranmer's views about the Mass are well-known. "It is abominable blasphemy that the Church hath any need of such Sacrifice. . . . The saying of Mass by the priest . . . is neither a Sacrifice propitiatory, nor yet a Sacrifice of laud and praise, *nor in any wise allowed before God, but abominable and detestable.*" (*Lord's Supper*, 248-252). In his 'Answer to Dr. Smith's Preface' Cranmer says: "I have denied that the Mass is a Sacrifice propitiatory for sin, or

[1] Bp. Hensley Henson of Durham says "The English Reformation . . . became under Edward VI mainly theological and practical, concerned with the abolition of the Mass in which the Scheme of mediæval religion had centred. (*Edinburgh Rev.* April 1924, p. 211.)

that the priest alone maketh any sacrifice there. For it is the sacrifice of all Christian people *to remember Christ's death* and to laud and thank Him for it." (p. 396.)

At Queen Elizabeth's accession, the leading divines, including Parker, whom she made Archbishop of Canterbury, addressed to her a petition and declared :

" Your Majesty's principal purpose is utterly to abolish all the errors and abuses used about the Lord's Supper, especially to root out the Popish Mass and all superstitious opinions concerning the same." (Strype's *Annals*, 161.)

Luther had denounced the Mass as ' the greatest and most horrible abomination and idolatry ' and he prophesied that ' the Papacy will stand or fall with the Mass.' The English Reformers quite clearly determined that *both* should fall. While rejecting in every form of vehement language of opprobrium the propitiatory Sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood offered on earthly altars, Cranmer admits that the Communion Service may be called a ' sacrifice of lauds and thanksgiving,' but is careful to explain that this is merely the offering of the people's and priest's prayers and their offering of themselves and of their alms. And such sacrifices of lauds are offered, he says, " in their private prayers or in any work they do at any time or place to the Glory of God." (Reply to Gardiner, Bk. V., § 393, and *passim* throughout his works.)

Confronted by the obvious fact that the Fathers of the Church constantly speak of the Mass as a Sacrifice, Cranmer replied : " They meant it was a sacrifice of lauds and thanksgiving (and so, as well the

people as the priest do sacrifice) or else that it was a *remembrance* of the very true propitiatory Sacrifice of Christ ; but they meant *in no wise*, that it is a very true Sacrifice for sin and applicable by the priest to the quick and dead." (ib).

Apostate Catholics had to declare when 'recanting' that they "also detest the Mass as abominable sacrilege, being a sacrifice; as the Papists term it, for the quick and the dead." Looking back on Cranmer's work, the seventh Canon of 1640 recorded that 'at the time of Reforming the Church from that gross superstition of Popery, it was carefully provided that all means should be used to root out of the minds of the people . . . that idolatry committed in the Mass ; for which cause all Popish altars were demolished.' It was the Mass itself that was a 'superstition' and 'idolatry' to the Reformers, just as it is regarded as such by present-day Evangelicals and Nonconformists. Miles Coverdale, one of the most vigorous promoters of the Edwardine Book says : 'Let us look wherefore they (the Papists) call it a sacrifice. Even so, say they, that in the Mass Christ the Son is offered up unto God the Father. Oh what great blasphemy is this. . . . Why do they call it a sacrifice seeing that it is but the remembrance of a sacrifice." (Defence of a Christian Man, p. 470.)

Since the times of the Tractarians and the Oxford Movement it has been the custom of Anglo-Catholics to say that their Church at the Reformation, while keeping the Mass, rejected in its Articles only certain heretical or superstitious notions about the Mass current in the minds of the people. Great weight is attached to the plural 'sacrifices' and we are told that 'sacrifices' are rejected but not the 'Sacrifice.'

But there were no heresies current in the pre-Reformation English Church about the Mass. The teaching of the pre-Reformation Church was definite, and there was nothing in the dogmatic decrees of the Council of Trent which may not be found substantially and unmistakably stated in the English pre-Reformation formularies, and also in the declaration of the Convocation in 1558, and in the replies of Bishop Gardiner to the heresies of Cranmer.

It must ever be emphasized that the sacrificial doctrine of Catholics and of extreme Anglo-Catholics to-day, was the doctrine which was so definitely rejected by Cranmer when he set to work to reform the liturgy and ordinal. Cranmer said he rejected the Mass '*as universally used in the Popish Kingdom*': just as King Edward VII at his coronation had to declare in the Presence of God that " the Sacrifice of the Mass *as now used in the Church of Rome* is superstitious and idolatrous."[1]

Take the Sarum Missal and compare it passage by passage with the Second Prayer Book of Cranmer which is substantially the one is use to-day. Take the Ordination Service of the Church of England and compare it with the Roman Pontifical which it supplanted. A learned student of the Reformation changes, the late Canon Moyes, thus sums up what you will find.

" In the Ordination Service of the Catholic Church there are no less than sixteen different parts in which the '*sacerdotium*' or sacrificial character is clearly expressed. Of these not one was suffered to remain

[1] This declaration, which is no longer imposed on our Sovereigns, was first used after the ' Popish Plot ' of Titus Oates and is contained in 30 Carol. II. st. 2.

in the Ordinal. Again out of twenty-four passages in the Mass which express our Lord's Real Presence and Sacrifice, not even one was allowed to remain in the liturgy." ('Eucharistic Congress 1908,' p. 46.)

That is to say: Compare the Mass and Catholic Ordinal with the Anglican Communion Service and Anglican Ordinal and you will find forty places where something has been cut out and that something has to do with the Real Presence or the Sacrifice of the Mass.

Look at the two and compare them for yourself and you cannot fail to see what has happened. The Catholic Doctrine of Real Presence and Sacrifice has been cut out as carefully as a surgeon cuts out cancerous tissue in an operation. Cranmer did his work so well that his ordinal stands in its historic context as an ordinal mutilated with a definite purpose, that of excluding a sacrificing priesthood from the reformed Church of England. And in excluding sacrificial priesthood he excluded the very essential and primary function of priesthood and hence, in the judgment of the Catholic Church, Anglican ministers to-day are not real priests.

Bishop Ryle of Liverpool spoke the exact truth when he said: "The Reformers found the Sacrifice of the Mass in our Church. They cast it out as a 'blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit' and called the Lord's Supper a Sacrament. . . . The reformers found altars in our Church. They ordered them to be taken down, cast the word 'altar' entirely out of our Prayer Book and spoke only of the Lord's Table and the Lord's Board. The reformers found our clergy sacrificing priests and made them prayer-reading, preaching ministers—

ministers of God's Word and Sacraments. The reformers found in our Church the doctrine of a real corporal Presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper, under the forms of bread and wine, and laid down their lives to oppose it. They would not even allow the expression 'real presence' a place in our prayer-book."[1] ('What we owe to the Reformation,' p. 19.)

Bishop Knox, writing recently about the Ordinal which he used for so many years as a Bishop of the Church of England says:

"No one reading the Roman Ordinal can doubt that it is full of the intention of ordaining sacrificing priests. No one reading the English Ordinal can suspect that it has any such object. Of sacrifice there is not a single word from first line to last. Nor is there in the Consecration of a Bishop, a hint that Bishops are to ordain sacrificing priests."

He adds: "It is true that certain priests of the Church of England offer so called Masses, but as they were not ordained by the Church with the intention that they should offer the Body and Blood of Christ to the Father, the Sacrament of their Ordination is, for this purpose, a failure." ('National Review,' September, 1925.)

Bishop Knox, speaking of Leo XIII's condemnation of Anglican Orders as invalid to convey Catholic

[1] Bishop Wordsworth of St. Andrews, at the 1890 'Church Congress' noted the significant fact that 'in the Sarum Missal we have the word 'altar' more than thirty times, whilst in our present, and in King Edward's Second Prayer Book, it does not occur once as describing the Holy Table.' The intention manifested in the change is obvious. Another bishop of like views, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, in a charge delivered in April, 1894, says of the English Ordinal: "You will not see the faintest indication that the Church of England calls (her ministers) to any sacerdotal function when she bids them 'Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God.'"

priesthood because of this defect in Cranmer's mutilated ordinal, says: 'In spite of the attempt made by our Archbishops to conceal the defect, the Pope, from his point of view, was unquestionably right." (*ibid.*)

Let us now look at this carefully worded reply made by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to the Bull on Anglican Orders to which Bishop Knox refers. The Pope had objected that the English Church had rejected the Sacrifice of the Mass in which the Body and Blood of Christ, really present on the Altar, is offered to the Father in Heaven.

The Archbishops claim that their Church has what they call 'the Eucharistic Sacrifice.' Listen to their plea and see if, by this assertion, they claim to offer Christ on the Altar. If they do not, then their Sacrifice is not a *real* but a *metaphorical* Sacrifice, like that spoken of by Cranmer when he pointed to the people's prayers and good works as 'sacrifices' of lauds and thanksgiving. It was easy to be clear. The issue was quite plain. The Archbishops could not give the only answer which was required. These are the Archbishops' words; they are characteristically vague.

"We continue a perpetual memory of the precious death of Christ who is our Advocate with the Father and propitiation of our sins, according to His precept, until His coming again. For first we offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; then next we plead and represent before the Father the Sacrifice of the Cross and by it we confidently entreat remission of sins and all other benefits of the Lord's Passion for all the whole Church; and lastly we offer the Sacri-

fice of ourselves to the Creator of all things, which we have already signified by the oblation of His Creatures (i.e., the bread and wine). This whole action, in which the people has necessarily to take its part with the priest, we are accustomed to call the Eucharistic Sacrifice."

A grandiloquent—but empty boast. Everything is there except the one essential. Nowhere does the Anglican Church in its liturgy offer the Body and Blood of Christ really present as Victim on the Altar of Sacrifice. It would be so simply said, if it were the truth, " We offer Christ here present and these are the words of our liturgy which express our offering." Had the Archbishops said that, there would have been an outcry from quite four-fifths of the Anglican Church. The Catholic bishops of England made a joint reply to the letter of the Anglican Archbishops from which we have quoted above. In that letter, having pointed out the ambiguity of the Archbishops' language, they say : ' It is notorious that many members of your Communion have understood you in this passage to be affirming the doctrine of a Real Objective Presence and of a Sacrifice founded on that, and it is this dispute about your meaning which moves us to ask you a question. It seems to us that, as the object of your letter was to make plain for all time the doctrine of your Church on the subject of Holy Orders, and this point about the Real Presence and the true Sacrifice lies at the very roots of that controversy, we are entitled to ask you to remove the doubt which has arisen in the way described and tell us in unmistakable terms what your real meaning is. If then, we have mistaken your meaning in the

passage referred to, will you frankly say so? But if we have understood you rightly, we must claim your reply as tantamount to an acknowledgment that the Bull (of Pope Leo) has not misjudged the character of your Ordinal. . . . It will be made clear that in your judgment as well as in that of Leo XIII, your Ordinal was never intended, and was therefore never fitted, to make sacrificing priests in the strict sense of the term." (*'A Vindication,'* p. 81.)

This plain question was addressed to the Anglican Archbishops more than thirty years ago by the combined Catholic Episcopate of this country. The Anglican Archbishops have never dared to reply. To have done so, would have been to cause the disruption of their Church. To have denied the Catholic Sacrifice as their meaning would have driven the extreme Anglo-Catholics to a Church which taught the doctrine of the Catholic Sacrifice. To have asserted it, would have driven the Evangelicals into Nonconformity. So they remain silent and have refused to give an authoritative interpretation of their ambiguous words. When all the Bishops were together debating the changes to be introduced in the new Prayer Book, the present Bishop of Liverpool analysed the Anglican Communion Service and showed how it differs from the Mass in this point—this one essential point—of the nature of the Sacrifice.

He said: "I think there is no doubt at all that in the Prayer Book at present we offer Sacrifice to God in Holy Communion:

"We offer first of all the Sacrifice of our alms; we offer the Sacrifice of the *unconsecrated* elements;

we offer the Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and we offer the Sacrifice of ourselves. But the offering of the *consecrated* elements as a Sacrifice to God was deliberately cut out of the Church of England Prayer Book. It was cut out because it was regarded as the *embryo of the Mass.*"

There was not any outcry raised, no single voice in that assembly of the Anglican Episcopate was heard in denial of what he said. What he said without contradiction from his brother Bishops was what Pope Leo XIII said in substance when refusing to accept Anglican Orders. 'No sacrifice, no priest': Then why call them priests?

The answer was given by the Reformer Richard Hooker.

"Seeing then that sacrifice is now no part of the Church ministry, how should the name priesthood be thereunto rightly applied? The Fathers of the Church . . . call usually the ministry of the Gospel priesthood in regard to that which the Gospel hath proportionable to the ancient sacrifices, namely the Communion of the Blessed Body and Blood of Christ, although it have properly now no sacrifice. As for the people, when they hear the name, it draweth no more their minds to any cogitation of sacrifice, than the name of senator or an alderman causeth them to think of old age." (Eccles. Pol., Bk. V, c. 78.)

Present-day Anglo-Catholics attempt to bring back the old literal meaning into the word which is still used as a title of Anglican ministers. They repudiate Cranmer but contend that the great Anglican divines of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries taught the same doctrine of the Eucharistic

Sacrifice in all essential points as is taught by the Catholic Church. They are ready to admit that Cranmer and the reformers often surrendered too much and attributed this to the tendency of the human mind when revolting against one extreme to run too far into the other. Dr. Pusey in Tract 81 says that the divines of the seventeenth century have left 'the calmer, deeper statements of men to whom God had given peace from the first conflict,' and that they give us 'a well-proportioned and equable exhibition of the several parts of the Catholic faith.' It will be found, however, that while maintaining that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, these writers do not really go beyond the doctrine of Archbishop Cranmer in which the thing offered is the prayer and praise and almsdeeds and self-oblation of the people, or at most the bread broken and wine outpoured as representative symbols of Our Lord's Body and Blood on Calvary. In the 'Vindication' (pp. 103-111) this is shown with regard to Guest, Jewell, Bilson, Hooker, Overall, Andrews, Laud, Mede, Cosin, Hammond, Jeremy Taylor, Bull, Hickes and Johnson. None of these assert more than is asserted in the passage from the Archbishops' reply to Pope Leo XIII and, as we have seen, that passage does not state the Catholic doctrine of the Mass. (See Note from Newman's 'Via Media,' p. 44.)

To sum up, the Reformers got rid of the Sacrifice of the Mass; they never thought of offering Christ really present as Victim on the Altar when they speak of 'pleading the One Sacrifice of Calvary': the great Anglican Divines, even when some of them seem to accept an Objective Presence under or in the bread and wine, nowhere speak clearly of

offering again to the Father that present Victim. It was left to Anglo-Catholics of these latter days to grasp the Catholic truth of the Sacrifice of the Mass, and to teach it in their pulpits and in their present-day pamphlets. But the Mass is no longer with them. Cranmer did his work too well!

No tardy acceptance of the Catholic doctrine about the Mass can bring back the reality of the Mass to a Church which cast it forth in the hour of its birth, and which has lived comfortably for 375 years without it. The greater part of the Anglican Church to-day rejects this Catholic oblation of Christ's Body and Blood as violently as did the Edwardine and Elizabethan reformers, who called it 'a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit,' who savagely broke into bits and trampled underfoot the Altar stones on which the Sacred Victim had lain, and who persecuted, harried and martyred at Tyburn the Catholic priests whose only crime was that they believed in and offered on their altars the Eucharistic Sacrifice of Christ for the souls of 'the quick and the dead.'

Canon Moyes brought the whole historical argument to the bar of common sense when he said, in the Albert Hall during the Eucharistic Congress of 1908:

"Had the reformers been striking at mere abuses or exaggerations, it is a matter of common sense that in that case they would have been all the more careful to safeguard the true use and sacrificial doctrine as marked off from the abuse, and they would have recognized the safeguarding as more imperative, knowing as they did that the whole sacrificial idea was being utterly denied and de-

nounced in France and Germany and by the reforming party in England. So far from making any attempt to safeguard it, they strike it out wherever they find it and they borrow and make their own the very words which the German and Swiss reformers used to deny it." (Congress Report, pp. 46, 47.) "If we believed in the Mass," he writes elsewhere, "we should not have caused Articles of Religion to be put in the Prayer Book for popular use, to be read publicly to the congregations in every church in the land, teaching them that Sacrifices of Masses were 'blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits,' without even a hint to poor Hodge or even to an educated man in the pew, that they must learn the puerile distinction between 'Sacrifice' and 'Sacrifices' and that the blasphemy attached only to the letter 's'."[1] ('Tablet,' November 28th, 1925.)

[1] The phrase 'Sacrificia missarum' occurs in a decree of the Council of Florence.

The following words of Bishop Dowden express the view which we have been defending above. "It is a mistake begotten of ignorance to suppose that in their theological pronouncements (the reformers) dealt merely or even chiefly with popular misconceptions and popular superstitions. They had in full view the authoritative teaching of the recognized doctors of the then prevailing mediæval theology."—('Theological Literature,' p 9.)

A NOTE ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION

Bishop Headlam, writing of the Eucharistic doctrine of the Anglican Church, says that his Church 'has condemned transubstantiation and Zwinglianism and between these limits it is admitted that our belief is free.' ("The Doctrine of the Church," p. 275.)

Modern Anglo-Catholics, while rejecting Transubstantiation, hold to a real Objective Presence of Christ in or under the elements. They do not usually attempt to define their belief more explicitly, but it would seem to be a form of enduring consubstantiation, not dissimilar to the transient consubstantiation of Luther.[1] The English reformers never got beyond a virtualism or receptionism which did not involve any Objective Presence in the elements. Hence, with them the alternative beliefs could be stated as a dilemma, and the Objective Presence was regarded as necessarily involving Transubstantiation.

Thus Nicholas Ridley, in his *Brief Declaration* written against Transubstantiation, states that the 'matter' of the sacrament is the point of issue between the Catholics and the Reformers. That 'matter' was, he declared, '*either* the natural substance of bread *or* the natural substance of Christ's Body and Blood.' He argues thus: 'If the matter be Christ's own natural Body, born of the Virgin, then assuredly they must needs grant transubstantia-

[1] "By Sacramental union the bread is the body of Christ, that is *when the bread is handed out* there is also present and truly exhibited the body of Christ. *For outside the use* . . . the Body of Christ is not present."—('Formula Concordiæ,' 1582.)

tion, that is a change of the substance of the bread into the substance of Christ's Body : then also must they grant a carnal and corporal presence of Christ's Body : then must the sacrament be adored with the honour due unto Christ Himself . . . then if the priest do offer the sacrament, he doth offer Christ Himself. Now on the other side, if . . . it be found that the substance of bread is the material substance of the Sacrament . . . there is no such thing as transubstantiation.' He concludes that the natural substance of bread *is* the true ' material substance of the Sacrament ' and ' The natural substance of Christ's human nature . . . is in Heaven where it now remaineth in glory, and not here enclosed under the form of bread. . . . Finally it doth follow that Christ's Blessed Body and Blood, which was once only offered and shed upon the Cross . . . is offered up no more in the natural substance thereof, neither by the priest nor any other thing.'

Here the whole argument would fail if Ridley drew that delicate distinction between Christ's ' real and substantial ' and his ' corporal ' or ' carnal ' presence, which is used by Anglo-Catholics to-day in explaining away the ' Black Rubric.' That distinction never entered the minds of the English Reformers.

The teaching of the Catholic Church is summed up in the Canon of the Council of Trent which anathematizes anyone " who says that the substance of the bread and wine remain, together with the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ, in the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist ; or who denies that wonderful and unique (singularem) conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body, and of the wine

into the Blood, the appearances, accidents or species (specibus) of bread and wine alone remaining, which conversion the Catholic Church most aptly calls 'transubstantiation.'"

This conversion is unique and unparalleled by any change which takes place in nature. It is not like that which takes place gradually when the matter of food is assimilated and gradually converted into living flesh. Transubstantiation does not assert that the Eucharistic Body of Christ is *made out of* the substance of the bread.

What before was the substance of bread, after Consecration has become the substance of Our Lord's risen Body. Our Lord's Body has no direct relation to the 'accidents' of the bread but only an indirect reference to them because the substance of bread in which those accidents inhered has been converted into His Sacred Body. When we are told that Our Lord is not present 'locally' or 'as in a place,' this does not deny that His Eucharistic Presence is limited to the places which are filled by the accidents which remain, but affirms that His Body is not related to place by its own quantity, but indirectly by that of the bread which no longer exists. Still, we can say truly, 'Christ is *there* on the altar,' 'Christ is carried in procession,' and in each case these 'local' predications are true because of the accidents under which He is present. Nor is Christ's presence 'local' in the sense that His Body is extended through the space after the natural manner of matter. He is present wholly in each part of the space, somewhat as the human soul is present wholly in each part of the body it animates. Bishop Temple in 'Christus Veritas' (p. 241) seems

either to deny the existence of the Risen Body or to endow it with Divine Immensity when he writes: "Where Christ is at all, there, I hold, He is altogether. To say that His Divinity is present everywhere, but His Humanity only in the Eucharist seems to me mythology, and nonsense at that."

Franzelin thus proves the Catholic doctrine from Our Lord's words of Institution.

"When Christ the Lord, taking bread, saith 'This is My Body,' he not only affirms that what He exhibits under the sensible species of bread is His Body, but He denies that it is bread. Why does the affirmation that this (the thing exhibited under the species of bread) is His Body involve the denial that the bread is still there? The reason is that while the substance of the bread persists, all that can be truly said is 'this is bread and present in the bread is My Body.' It cannot be said 'This *is* My Body'; and the reason of this is because the pronoun 'this,' directed to the sensible species of the bread, only indicates the substance of the bread co-natural to the species as long as it in fact remains. Nor can it, without deception, be adopted to indicate an alien substance invisibly present along with the bread." (De Euch., p. 258.)

In the face of this reasoned exegesis, it is surely foolish of Protestants to dismiss the doctrine of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation as palpably opposed to Scripture. Rather are these doctrines involved in the *literal* truth of Our Lord's words.

Many Anglo-Catholics are coming to recognize that transubstantiation is a most spiritual and in no sense a 'carnal' or 'materialistic' explanation of the Real Presence. Thus, Canon T. A. Lacey, writ-

ing on the twenty-eighth Article says: 'The article is, verbally at least, a direct contradiction of the doctrine previously received by the Church of England in common with the whole Western Church.' He admits 'the difficulty of finding any plain words of Scripture' to which the doctrine is repugnant. . . . Transubstantiation, as taught by the greatest scholastics, before the aberrations of Scotism, was a simple reduction of the words 'This is My Body' to the terms of the Aristolelian logic, and it seemed the only form of statement by which grave errors could be excluded. . . . By the use of the Aristotelian categories, which are merely a common sense analysis of perception, the Real Presence was restricted to the category of *pure being or substance*, the categories of place and time and extension and the like being ruled out. The result, as Franzelin put it, is that the sacramental Body of Christ is purely noumenal (i.e., *real* but not perceptible to sense. F.W.) *If any one desires a definition of spiritual presence, here it is and it would be hard to find one better suited for the purpose.* . . Construing the Article, therefore, in a reasonable, benevolent way, we must assume that the 'transubstantiation' condemned by it is not that which was taught by the great scholastics or retained in the best traditions of Latin theology.' ('The Anglo-Catholic Faith, pp. 127, 128.)

This 'benevolent construction' seems modelled on the benevolent constructions of Tract XC; but I fear that it assumes a good deal which the framers of the Articles would repudiate. Dr. Darwell Stone admits that "hardly any, if any, theologians at the present time hold a theory of Transubstantiation to

which serious religious objection can be made." (Faith of an English Catholic, p. 38.)

In his ' Greek Orthodox Thought ' (p. 326), Dr. F. Gavin, M.A., Th.D., tells us that " essentially there is no distinction in Orthodox teaching between the Orthodox doctrine of transubstantiation and the Roman doctrine : the only difference on this point between East and West being one of temperament : the Orthodox disavows any attempt to explain the manner of the change, but uses the term and maintains the theory of transubstantiation. . . . In short the teaching of the Orthodox Church as to the Real Presence is indistinguishable from that of the Roman Church as defined at the Council of Trent."

The Council of Jerusalem, while teaching the doctrine of transubstantiation adds ' the manner we do not believe to be capable of explanation.' Catholics agree that the manner remains a mystery, even after the explanation given by the Council of Trent. That explanation never professed to eliminate mystery from the ' Mysterium Fidei ' !

When the Non-jurors approached the Eastern Orthodox Patriarchs in the eighteenth century, they were given the Orthodox theology as part of the doctrinal demands of the Eastern Church. The Non-Jurors in their reply said : ' we can by no means agree with their Lordships' doctrine, such corporal presence which they call transubstantiation having no foundation on Scripture.' The Easterns, in acknowledging the receipt of this reply, said that they had nothing to add to their previous communication, in which they had characterized the Non-Jurors' views of the nature of the Presence as ' blasphemy.' The Non-Jurors were told plainly that

before recognition could be given to them 'they must submit . . . with sincerity and obedience and without any scruple or dispute' to the teaching which had been expounded to them. (See Lathbury's 'History of the Non-Jurors,' p. 335.)

The same conditions for intercommunion would be insisted on to-day, for the Orthodox are still too proud of their title to overlook heretical opinions in those whom they admit to that confederation of autocephalous national Churches which they call the Holy Orthodox Church.

IV

CATHOLIC TRUTH AND PRAYER BOOK REVISION

I now turn to discuss the Revised Prayer Book, a topic which evidently interests a large number of people at the present time. It is well for Catholics to take an intelligent interest in a matter which may be the occasion of many earnest souls coming at last to see Anglicanism as it really is. Many Anglicans may come to realize that no ' branch ' of the Catholic Church could, in revising its liturgy, be governed by the principles which seem to have controlled the production of the new Prayer Book.

And before we examine any details, let us note the declarations made by the two Archbishops in presenting the Book to their Convocations. Both the Archbishops of Canterbury and of York strongly affirm that the new Book contains no change of doctrine. They assert that the Book which they owe to the protestant reformers of the sixteenth century, along with the XXXIX Articles is still the authentic, official and authoritative expression of the belief of the Anglican Church. These are the words of the Archbishop of Canterbury : " I wish to say emphatically that in my judgment, nothing that we have suggested makes any change in the doctrinal position of the Church of England." He

admitted, however, that 'the *balance of emphasis* may here and there be somewhat altered.'

The Archbishop of York is equally clear: "The old book of Common Prayer will not only retain its text and the right to be used in the Services of the Church: it will remain as an authoritative expression and standard of the doctrines of the Church of England." He said that he believed that any changes which were introduced were "in conformity with the doctrine of the Church of England as set forth in the XXXIX Articles and the Book of Common Prayer."

So the Church in revising her liturgy is alleged by the Archbishops *not* to have revised her faith.

These deliberate and emphatic statements of the Archbishops have not however, been accepted universally as accurate, and most of the opposition to the Book from Low Church Evangelicals is on the ground that the Anglican beliefs *have* been tampered with and that new doctrines, opposed to the old Prayer Book doctrines, have been introduced by the Bishops.[1]

The chief points of Evangelical objection refer to the new prayers for the souls of the dead, and the changes in the Communion Office and the permission for the reservation of the consecrated elements which, Evangelicals assert, involve a doctrine of a

[1] 'The Record,' a Low Church organ, said bluntly: "The Archbishops and Bishops assure us that there is no doctrinal change: For our part we cannot agree with them. . . . It is very hard to avoid seeing the restoration of the Mass in the New Canon when the use of vestments is taken in connection with it" (February 10th, 1927.) A leading Protestant layman, Lord Parmoor, Chairman of the House of Laity, writing to the 'Times' (July 1st) said: "I cannot doubt that the Revised Prayer Book does introduce, as an alternative, a change of doctrine."

real Objective Presence and which, they say, brings back the Mass. These points we shall consider later. But before dealing with them, let us notice the basic principle which seems to have controlled the revision, viz., the aim to extend the Church's 'comprehensiveness.'

It would be idle for any Anglican to-day to pretend that the Church's members all have the same beliefs. Nowadays it is frankly admitted that the established Church is made up of Anglo-Catholics and Low Church Evangelicals, who are quite opposed to each other in very many and important beliefs, and that there is also an increasing number of Liberals or Modernists—we need not quarrel about their title—who are found both among Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals as well as among the 'non-party' average Anglicans.

Anglo-Catholics believe in the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharistic bread and wine, and in the Sacrifice of the Mass, and they think it right to adore Christ present as they believe, under the forms of bread and wine after the Consecration. They are taught regularly to confess their sins and to seek absolution from their 'priests'; they honour and pray to the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, and they celebrate 'Requiem Masses' and pray for the souls departed.[1]

Evangelicals and Modernists reject all such beliefs and practices and regard the adoration of Christ under the elements as sheer idolatry.

The Anglican bishops were anxious not to drive out of the Church any of these conflicting parties;

[1] 'Chantry Masses' are advertised as taking place about three times a month in S. Mary's Church, Graham St.

they wished to make all satisfied that their views are sufficiently recognized and expressed in the new liturgy.

The result is that the new Book seems to contain within one cover, at times vaguely but I believe really, the expression of contradictory beliefs. Violent opposition, shown to it by the extremists of both parties, is the result of this attempt to import into the liturgy the comprehensiveness which is so characteristic of the Church's membership.

The Royal Commission had set before the revising bishops the ideal " to secure the greater elasticity which a reasonable recognition of the comprehensiveness of the Church of England and its present needs seems to demand." When the Archbishop of York was speaking to Convocation he emphatically declared that " Our desire has been to secure, not *compromise for the sake of peace,* but *comprehension for the sake of truth,* of the fullness and richness of the one fellowship of faith and life." Many of the critics of the Book have roundly asserted that there *is* much compromise, though the same critics deny that it is likely to bring peace to the Church. It would seem that ' comprehension for the sake of truth ' is a curious phrase for a form of comprehension which is content to express opposed and even contradictory opinions and leave them side by side uncondemned, in one book, without any attempt to synthesize or reconcile them.

The Bishop of Ripon said recently : " It should be regarded as a sign of strength rather than one of weakness that in taking away the operation of the Act of *Uni*formity, which represented the same spirit as Papalism in the Roman

Catholic Church, and in creating in its stead an ' Act of *Multi*-formity, the Church of England is doing something that is new in Christendom." (The Guardian,' March 18th, 1927.)

But that ' uniformity ' of the past was merely an external uniformity of rite. It did not prove, nor was it intended to involve uniformity or unity of belief

Speaking of the old Prayer Book, the Archbishop of Canterbury said to Convocation recently : " The significance of our old Prayer Book never lay merely in the uniformity which it secured. It lay also in the fact that the book was patient of certain varieties of interpretation, and so, in consequence, was capable of being used by loyal Churchmen of different opinions and different outlook. In this it showed its English character. This was the open secret of its power as a bond of unity." Of the new Book he said : " The book must continue to bear, beyond all doubt, the distinctive character which marks the Church of England, Catholic and Reformed. It must be capable of being happily used by devout worshippers belonging to each group or section of really loyal Anglican Churchmen." (Report of Debate, March 29th, p. 5.) Here was a problem ! How to provide an Eucharistic service which could be ' used happily ' by those who believe in a ' Real Objective Presence ' of Christ in the Eucharistic elements and by those who believe in a ' real absence ' ; one which expresses a true Sacrifice to suit present-day Anglo-Catholic belief and yet expresses no sacrificial oblation so as to suit Evangelicals who regard such offering as blasphemous. The solution adopted was to have two different services

and to let the second be a permissive rite to be used by those who like it.

A Church which permits and makes provision for such a variety of beliefs among its members is certainly utterly unlike the Church of the Councils which did not seek to conciliate by compromise nor attempt to keep heretics in its membership by 'comprehensive' dogmatic tolerance, but rather anathematized and excommunicated those who refused to accept the doctrines she defined. The Church of the Councils, like the Catholic Church of to-day which is in continuity with it, knew its own message, expressed it clearly and refused membership and communion to all who rejected that message.

Let me quote a passage from the organ of the Anglo-Catholic party, *The Green Quarterly*. Contrast the mentality there expressed with the attitude of a Catholic or even of a member of the Eastern Orthodox Churches. Truly, as the Bishop of Ripon said of the 'multiformity,' 'it is something new in Christendom!'

Here are the opening words of the Spring number of *The Green Quarterly* (1927), written apropos of the New Prayer Book:

"In our view it is a strange irony that critics of the Church of England should describe as her weakness, that which is in reality her strength. She is the only religious body in the world which is in miniature a league of religions. It is invaluable that Catholics" (i.e., Anglo-Catholics), "and Protestants, Moderates and Liberals should be in communion with one another rather than separated in sectarian fragments. These various Anglican

religious groups are working together more and more efficiently ; they are learning to be tolerant rather than controversial towards each other and their association forms an admirable corrective mutual influence. If only we can preserve this priceless possession, the advantages both to the Church and the nation are invaluable."

What wonder that Anglo-Catholics were divided and bewildered when they found their extreme 'party-organ' in the opening words of its editorial congratulating them on having the 'priceless possession' of Modernists, who deny the Godhead of Christ, and Evangelicals, who deny the Real Presence, as members of their Church—which they believe to be a branch of the Catholic Church ! Since when have Anglo-Catholics come to believe that the strength of their Church—and not its weakness—consists in this mingling of 'faithful' and 'heretics' in its membership ? When was the ideal of the Catholic Church framed as 'a league of religions' which profess contradictory faiths ?

But let us now look at the new Book from the point of view of the various parties. What has each gained ? Let us begin with the Modernists or Liberals. Modernists undoubtedly found some things they objected to in the old Book, some 'hard sayings,' but they discovered ways and means of using it without offence to their consciences. They invented mental reservations to enable them to recite the Nicene Creed, and to say 'the third day He arose again from the dead,' 'born of the Virgin Mary,' while disbelieving the Resurrection and the Virgin Birth. And so too they found 'interpretations' for the clauses which so definitely express

the Godhead of Christ, a doctrine which they had ceased to believe in any real sense.

Indeed, they seem to have managed so well with the old Book that they might have been left without special consideration being had for their views in the Revision. Yet there are changes in the New Book which can only be regarded as made for their relief. For example, we note the change in the wording in the ordination Service where the Bishop has to question the candidate as to his belief in Holy Scripture. The old question was: "Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments?" And the candidate had to reply 'I do.' A very significant change has been made and not one which has slipped in by accident but been deliberately proposed, debated and approved by the Bishops. The question now stands: "Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as given by God to convey to us *in many parts and diverse manners* the revelation of Himself which is fulfilled in Our Lord Jesus Christ." The 'parts' of Scripture which convey God's revelation and the 'diverse manners' in which it is conveyed are now left to the discretion of the candidates. One who accepted the extremest views of rationalist criticism could still say 'I do believe,' even though the 'diverse manners' to him often mean solely the acceptance as a mythical moral tale of what Christians believe to be a plain record of fact.

The way in which the doctrine of original sin seems to be made merely 'permissive,' is also a change made, it seems, in the interest of Modernist disbelief in that Christian doctrine. Where the collect in the

old Book said "*for as much as all men are conceived and born in sin*"—the alternative prayer in the New Book says 'God willeth all men to be saved, for God is love.' The phrase which is excised was offensive to Modernists so they are given an alternative which emphasizes a more comfortable doctrine.

Such prayers in the Marriage service as alluded to Adam and Eve and such in the Baptism service as introduced allusions to Noah and the Passage of the Red Sea, and the words of the Pentecost preface which spoke of the miracles which accompanied the advent of the Holy Ghost—the gift of tongues and the tongues of fire—have all been amended so that they no longer offend the enlightened Modernist who disbelieves in the personal existence of Adam and Eve and rejects all miracles. These allusions to the supernatural have been cut out in the alternative offices.

And finally, most important of all, surely it must be in the Modernist interest that the recital of the Athanasian Creed, hitherto obligatory on a number of festivals, is now merely permissive in the services of the Anglican Church.

No Modernist need, in future, be pained by the opening clauses of the 'Quicumque Vult,' which lay such stress on the importance of right Catholic belief—an attitude of mind violently opposed to Anglican dogmatic tolerance and the policy of 'believe what you like.' The Athanasian Creed in its opening words denied absolutely the principle of dogmatic indifference and so was offensive to those who are accustomed to recite the Nicene Creed, not for its truth, but as an interesting survival, a

link between an ignorant age now passed and gone for ever.

The *Church Times*[1] reminded its readers that when the question was raised more than fifty years ago as to whether the Church should cease using this Creed, Canon Liddon said : " A change which affects any one of the three creeds is in the nature of an organic change. It touches the life of the Church of England at its centre."

A writer in the same issue declared that Dr. Pusey would have been driven out of the Anglican Church had it passed a measure such as has been accepted by that Church in its Revised Book. The ' English Church Union ' on June 21st, held a meeting of protest against this tampering with the Creeds, but there was not the remotest chance of the old rubric being restored at the last hour. That rubric decreed that the Athanasian Creed ' *shall* be said ' : the new rubric only changes one word but that change is a fundamental one in principle. It declares that the Creed ' *may* be said.' Speakers at the ' English Church Union ' meeting pointed out the absurdity of a *soi-disant* part of the Catholic Church giving leave to its members to recite or to refuse to recite a Creed which had for centuries been an obligatory and valued part of its liturgy.

The Modernists had certainly been considered when the Bishops were at work making their Prayer Book more comprehensive.

It is hard to see what the Low Church Evangelicals have gained. They are still allowed to use the old Book, if their minister and Church Council so wish, or, in case of disagreement between these two,

[1] Ch. T., June 17, 1927, p. 729.

if the Bishop so decides. Their opposition to the Book was not because they are now *obliged* to use the new Communion office or to reserve the Eucharist or to pray for the dead, but because their Church in giving these permissions seems to have departed from the Reformation Protestant Settlement to which the Evangelicals are loyal. It seems to compromise their Protestant Church. Possibly to please them the Black Rubric which I quoted in the last chapter is printed in such heavy and emphatic type that it appears to be the most important matter in the whole Prayer Book. But Evangelicals have noticed that this rubric has been left out of the Alternative Communion Order which follows and have protested at the omission. They must console themselves, however, with the declaration of the Archbishops that there is no change of doctrine and that whatever the Black Rubric meant in the old Book is still its authentic meaning and it still stands as a statement of the doctrine of the Church of England.

I have kept to the end the consideration of Anglo-Catholic gains.

They have now gained the permission of their Church to reserve the consecrated elements for the purpose of communicating the sick. They have done so hitherto without permission and in violation of the laws of their Church. Over 140 London Churches had the Sacrament thus reserved before the Revised Book was presented to the Convocations. In many of these Churches it had been the object of public devotions similar to Benediction Service. Such 'devotions' *must now cease;* so declare the New Book and the Bishops.[1] But there is not

[1] At the spring session of his Diocesan Conference in 1925,

much likelihood of this law being generally observed by extreme Anglo-Catholics who will, I imagine, carry on as before. A letter to the '*Times*' signed by the vicars of two leading Anglo-Catholic Churches as representatives of a group of clergymen, makes it clear that obedience will be refused, and this letter was followed by one over the names of a number of leading Anglo-Catholic laymen who stated that they will support their clergy in their refusal to obey.

A special hardship will possibly fall on enclosed Anglican nuns who may have the Sacrament removed from their convent altars, as reservation there may be judged by the Bishop of the diocese to be unnecessary for the only purpose for which reservation is permitted—viz., the Communion of the Sick. Certainly difficulties may be looked for in some dioceses, because the reservation depends on the Bishop's judgment as to its necessity for the sick alone.

What can they expect, e.g., in Birmingham? In the presence of the two Archbishops and the whole Episcopate and Convocations of both Provinces, Canon Long of Birmingham stated the danger and in proof quoted the words of Bishop Barnes of Birmingham that "You can no more reserve a psychological process than you can reserve an exploding shell"; to him the presence of Christ is merely 'virtual' and 'a psychological process' in the soul of the devout receiver. The Bishop also said about

the Bishop of London said that 'he found the one thing which was in the way of *real union in the Church of England* was 'devotions' in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament.' ('Times,' June 9th.) One would have thought that the existence of three divided and opposed parties in the Church was a greater bar to 'real union' than this extra-liturgical service in some churches.

Communion for the sick and dying: 'a wafer by itself is of no more value than a penny placed in the hands of a dying man to pay his fare to the grim ferryman who shall take him safely across the Styx.' There is no security or guarantee against any number of men of the mentality of Bishop Barnes being introduced in the English Episcopate in the future, for the nominations depend on the Prime Minister and normally his selections may be influenced more by political considerations than ecclesiastical fitness. Anglo-Catholics can complain justly that hitherto they have not had proportionate representation on the bench of Bishops.

Let us now examine the changes made in the Alternative Communion Office. These changes are radical and they seem to me to make the new Office a definite approach to the Catholic Mass.[2] In this I think Anglo-Catholics have gained. In the old Office, immediately after saying the words of Consecration in the same form as in the Mass, without any prayers of oblation over the consecrated bread and wine, the minister and people received the Communion.

In the Alternative Order in the Revised book, certain prayers have been introduced which include elements previously lacking and which seem to me definitely to bring the service in line with the Mass. These new prayers, introduced it is to be noted *after* the consecration words " This is my Body, this is my

[2] Bishop Headlam of Gloucester, a supporter of the Book, does not admit this. He says the New Book ' is entirely out of harmony with Roman theology . . . the one thing that is not true about it is that it brings the Communion Office nearer to the Mass.' (*Guardian*, 11th February, 1927.) He stresses the position of the Epiklesis, after the Consecration, as proof of his point.

Blood," express an oblation of the consecrated bread and wine ; they also speak of 'this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' in a new context by putting the words between the Consecration and Communion, and they contain a prayer for the remission of sins in connection with the oblation of the consecrated elements. These prayers, introduced in this part of the service, would seem to be reasonably and sufficiently patient of a sacrificial and propitiatory interpretation which is entirely absent from the 1559 and 1662 Order.

The Epiklesis or prayer of invocation of the Holy Spirit put *after* the consecration should not create a greater difficulty to Anglicans than that overcome by Rome when it approved the similar prayers found in a similar position in all the Uniat liturgies accepted by the Pope for Easterns in communion with the Holy See.

Anglo-Catholics who believe in the Catholic doctrine of the Mass, should recognize how much they have gained in this new Office and if they are worried at the position of the prayer to the Holy Ghost, they may comfort themselves with the thought that the Catholic Church approves the liturgies of the East which are imitated in this feature of the Permissive Alternative Order.[3] I have said these prayers are

[3] I think Lord Halifax misses the chief significance of the Revision when he says in a letter to the *Church Times*, written on the eve of the meeting of the Assembly which finally approved the Deposited Book : (July 1st, 1927). "Should the Deposited Book and Measure become law, I cannot conceal from myself that any attempt to enforce many of their provisions must cause irretrievable damage to the whole Church of England, *and put an end to those hopes of reunion*, which at home and abroad had seemed to be dawning on Christendom." It is not regulations forbidding 'devotions' before the reserved sacrament, but the principle of doctrinal indifference and comprehensiveness which bar the way to Christian reunion.

capable of being interpreted in a Catholic sense. They are also capable of being interpreted in a purely Evangelical and Calvinistic sense and so they may be said to be still characteristically Anglican and comprehensive. But what the Archbishop of Canterbury calls '*the emphasis*' would seem to be on the Anglo-Catholic view.

Here then I conclude, but with this word of caution. Even if the Anglican Church were to adopt the Roman Missal to-day instead of its new Prayer Book, the breach in continuity would not be healed—for after all, *continuity must be continuous!*

The Anglo-Catholic return to Catholic belief in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass does not, *cannot* wipe out the awful effects of the rejection of the Mass at the Reformation Settlement. Their belief to-day may be 'Anglo-Catholic,' but it departs from the Anglican tradition and from the doctrine found generally in the great Anglican divines fron Cranmer to the Tractarians. And a true part of Christ's infallible Church can no more deliberately express its dogmas in ambiguous terms to foster heretics within its membership, than it can teach heresy clearly, unmistakably and without any ambiguity. The vaunted comprehensiveness of Anglicanism is the most patent sign that it is not Catholic.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Constantinople, Canterbury and Rome. A criticism of the Anglo-Catholic position. (Longmans 2/6.)

Modernism and the Christian Church. With a chapter on reunion." (Longmans 2/6.)

The Anglican Church and "Reunion." A lecture delivered in Rome, 1926. (2nd Edit. Catholic Truth Society, 2d.)

INDEX

Adamnan, 11
Adam Scot, 18
Aelred, St., 18
Alcuin, 14
Altars, 10, 11, 48, 50, 51 n.
Alternative rites, 71, 78
Anglo-Catholics, 25, 34, 40, 48, 54, 55, 59, 62, 68, 71, 76, 79
Anselm, St., 17
Archbishops, Angl., 52
Arians, 41
Arles, Council of, 10
Articles, 39, 37, 63, 66
Athanasian Creed, 74
Augustine, St., 12

Bath and Wells, Bp. of, 51
Bede, Ven., 11, 13
Bells, Sanctuary, 22
Berengarius, 16, 21
Birinus, St., 12, 13
Birmingham, Bp. of, 77
Birt, Dom N., O.S.B., 26
Bishops, Election of, 78
'Black Rubric,' 33, 60, 76
British Church, 9
Bucer, M., 27
Bullinger, 31

Canon of Mass, 20
Canterbury, Archb., 66, 70
Carter, Dr. C. S., 24
Catechism, 37
Chantries, 20, 68 n.
'Church Times,' 32 n.
Colet, Dean, 21
Columba, St., 11
Communion, Angl., 45, 52, 54
Comprehensiveness, 68-71, 80
Consubstantiation, 59
Continuity, 7, 80
Coronation Oath, 49
Corporals, 12
Councils, General, 71
Coverdale, Miles, 48
Cox, Canon A. P., 37
Cranmer, 26 *seqq.*, 46, 79 n.

David, Bp., 54
'Declaration of Faith,' 42
'Depositum Fidei,' 8
Development, 7
'Devotions,' 76
Dowden, Bp. 58

E.C.U., 75
'Eating Christ's Flesh,' 28, 29
Elevation of Host, 21
'Epiklesis,' 78, 79 n.
Evangelicals, 67, 75

Faith, 30
Formularies, Angl., 9, 66
Franzelin, 62

Gardiner, Bp., 31
Gavin, Dr. F., 64
Gildas, 11
'Green Quarterly,' 71
Gregory, St., 16
'Guardian,' 17
Guitmund, 19

Halifax, Lord, 41 n., 79
Hampton Court Conf., 37
Haymo, 15
Headlam, Bp., 59, 78 n.
Hensley Henson, Bp., 31, 46
Henry VIII, 20
Heresy, 71

Honorius, Pope, 12
Hooker, Rich., 55
Host, 11, 14, 21

Jerome, St., 10
Jerusalem Synod, 40, 64
John Chrysostom, St., 10
'John Bull' tracts, 43

Kidd, Dr. B., 43
Kind, Comm. under one, 13, 22
Knox, Bp., 51
Knox, John, 34

Lacey Canon T., 62
Lanfranc, 16
Lateran Council, 18
Latimer, 27
'Lauds and thanksg.,' 43 n., 47, 79
Leo XIII, Pope, 51, 54
Liddon, Canon, 75
Liturgy, British, 11
London, Bp. of, 76 n.
Long, Canon, 77
Luther, 47, 59

Mass, 11, 13, 45 *seqq.*
— Canon of, 20
— Sacrifice of, 12 n., 14, 16, 19, 39, 43
Marriage Service, 74
Melitus, St., 12
Miracles, 74
Modernists, 68, 72
Moyes, Canon, 49, 55
Multilocation, 18, 35

Newman, J. H., 44
Nicea, Council, 7
Ninian, St., 11
Non-Jurors, 40 n., 64
Nuns, Angl., 77

Orders, Angl., 32, 49, 51, 73
Original Sin, 73
Orthodox Church, 40, 64

Parker, Archb., 47
Pontificals, 14
Prayer Book, 25, 26, 31 *seqq.*, 49, 66
Priesthood, Angl., 55
Pulleyn, Card., 18
Pusey, Dr., 44, 56, 75

Real Presence, 28 *seqq.*
Receptionism, 28, 32, 59
'Record,' 67
'Reservation,' 12, 20, 67, 76
Reformers, 33, 41, 46, 56
'Reunion,' 65, 79
Ridley, Bp., 59
Ripon, Bp. of, 69
Royal Commission, 69
Ryle, Bp., 50

'Sacrifices,' 48, 58
Sarum Missal, 49
Savoy Confer., 34
Scottish Church, 7 n., 18
Scriptures, 73
Smyth, C. H., 27
'Species,' 17, 18, 61
Stone, Dr. D., 34, 38, 44, 63

Temple, Bp., 61
Tractarians, 44, 48
Tradition, Angl., 9, 42, 44, 56, 80
Transubstantiation, 8, 11, 14, 15, 17, 40 n., 46, 59
Trent, Council of, 60

Uniat Liturgies, 79
Upton, 21

'Vindication,' 54

Wilfrid, St., 13
Wordsworth, Bp., 51 n.

York, Archb., 67

Zurich, Letters, 27
Zwinglianism, 59

THE TWELVEPENNY SERIES

The Twelvepenny Series is designed to serve as a commentary on much that passes for Knowledge to-day. The immediate popularization of fact and theory in scholarship is a feature of modern life. The Catholic can call much of this into question, but hitherto has not had the opportunity of easily doing so. It is now supplied by the publication of these little books, which are authoritative, and yet simply written and published at a very low price.

MR. BELLOC STILL OBJECTS TO MR. WELLS'S OUTLINE OF HISTORY. By HILAIRE BELLOC.

Mr. H. G. Wells wrote an *Outline of History*: the Catholic *Companion* was supplied by Mr. Belloc (Sheed & Ward, 7s. 6d.): the treatment therein of evolution called forth a reply from Mr. Wells: and Mr. Belloc here gives the last word in a brilliant contest.

GENERAL COUNCILS AND ANGLICAN CLAIMS—in the light of the Council of Ephesus. By REV. S. H. SCOTT, D.Phil., B.Litt. (Oxon), F.R.Hist.Soc.

A very drastic revision of commonly accepted theories about Reunion is made necessary by Dr. Scott's work. Writing as an Anglican he condemns to the limbo of quaint historical errors much that has hitherto been said about General Councils.

THE REFORMATION AND THE BLESSED EUCHARIST—with a chapter on Anglican Prayer Book revision. By FRANCIS WOODLOCK, S.J.

The utterance of authoritative Catholic opinion on the Reformation and the subsequent Anglican doctrine of the Eucharist is necessary in view of the present discussion on the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer and the Anglo-Catholic Eucharistic Congress.

SOME INEXACTITUDES OF MR. G. G. COULTON. By HERBERT THURSTON, S.J.

Mr. Coulton is commonly accepted as an authority on Mediæval History. But all that he has to say is vitiated by an anti-Catholic bias, which may, or may not, have something to do with "Some Inexactitudes."

COBWEBS OF ANGLICANS. By REV. RONALD KNOX.

CONTINUITY IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By JOSEPH CLAYTON.

MODERN SPIRITUALISM. By HERBERT THURSTON, S.J.

ALL THE ABOVE, PRICE ONE SHILLING

SHEED & WARD

236.308
W.859

1916

WOODLOCK, Francis

AUTHOR

The Reformation & the Blessed Eucharist

TITLE

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	ROOM NUMBER
	FR DONOVAN	

1916